



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2019

No. 206

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of the Ages, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We continue to ask You to be with us here in the people's House. Political energy is high, yet we ask that You bless the Members with a surfeit of wisdom and discernment as they continue toward the end of the first session.

May the work to be completed result in blessings for our Nation in the funding of the government for the next year.

Finally, please send a healing spirit upon this assembly, upon our Nation. Much harsh language and accusation have been heard in the Chamber; help us all to be ambassadors of peace and reconciliation, so that all Americans might have hope in a united future.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant the section 7(a) of House Resolution 758, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. TORRES of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5377, RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT

Mrs. TORRES of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-357) on the resolution (H. Res. 772) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ELECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 773

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM: Ms. Porter and Ms. Haaland.

Mr. JEFFRIES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIR OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND REFORM,
Washington, DC, December 17, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI: I write to notify you and the House of Representatives of the initiation by the Committee on Oversight and Reform of judicial proceedings pursuant to H. Res. 497 and H. Res. 430. The Committee has initiated the following civil action:

Committee on Oversight and Reform, U.S. House of Representatives v. Barr, No. 1:19-cv-03557, filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia on November 26, 2019.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
Chairwoman.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSE AND CORRUPTION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-87)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H12213

emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13818 of December 20, 2017, is to continue in effect beyond December 20, 2019.

The prevalence and severity of human rights abuse and corruption that have their source, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States, continue to threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Human rights abuse and corruption undermine the values that form an essential foundation of stable, secure, and functioning societies; have devastating impacts on individuals; weaken democratic institutions; degrade the rule of law; perpetuate violent conflicts; facilitate the activities of dangerous persons; undermine economic markets; and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13818 with respect to serious human rights abuse and corruption.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 18, 2019.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5377, RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 772 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 772

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to commit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During

consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 772, providing for consideration of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, SALT has been in law since the 16th Amendment was passed in 1913 with few minor adjustments, that is, until 2017, when Republicans passed the tax scam law.

In 2017, the Republicans gave away almost \$2 trillion in tax cuts to corporations and the wealthy. They paid for this tax scam on the backs of hard-working American families. Thirty-six million middle-class families saw their taxes increase.

The average American deducted \$12,500 in State and local taxes, or SALT, from their Federal taxes before 2017. However, the Republican tax bill capped SALT deductions at \$10,000, therefore, not fully covering what the average American deducts in State and local taxes. This cap means that Americans are paying taxes twice on the same dollar earned.

Our tax system is based on the principle of federalism and acknowledges that the Federal Government should not do everything.

State and local taxes provide funds for critical infrastructure and services, such as ensuring quality schools for our kids, fixing our roads, and supporting our local law enforcement.

Local governments know how to meet the unique needs of their communities, and the implementation of a SALT deduction cap threatens the ability of our local governments to provide these critical services.

The SALT deduction is not a Democratic or Republican issue. Taxpayers across the country in both red and blue States benefit from the deduction.

Midwestern States like Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin are known for their State and local tax contributions. In fact, Wisconsin ranks among the top five States in the country, higher than California, for the average proportion of a resident's income tax that goes toward State and local taxes.

Whether from California, Wisconsin, or New Jersey, getting rid of the SALT cap will benefit Americans across the country.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am supporting H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax

Fairness for States and Localities Act. This legislation will raise the SALT cap for 2019 to \$20,000 for married couples.

Under the Republican tax bill, the SALT cap is set at \$10,000 for a household regardless if that household consists of an individual or two people filing jointly.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think taxpayers should be punished for being married.

This legislation will completely repeal the SALT cap for 2020 and 2021, ensuring that Americans are not taxed double on their hard-earned money.

Included in H.R. 5377 are investments in our teachers and law enforcement officers. I have heard from southern Californian teachers who are working two or three jobs to make ends meet, but they still buy supplies for their students: notebooks, chalk, pencils, markers, whatever they need.

Across the country, nearly all teachers report buying school supplies for their students with their own money, spending almost \$500 on average.

Currently, the tax credit for out-of-pocket expenses for educators is \$250. This legislation will double the tax credit to \$500, matching what is actually spent, what teachers spend for their students.

It also creates a new tax deduction for law enforcement officers, firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs related to expenses for uniforms and for tuition fees for professional development training. As a former 911 dispatcher, I can testify to the importance of having well-trained first responders.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5377 is about restoring fair tax policies for the middle class that have been suffering under the Republican tax bill, and I am proud to stand here in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is our third rule debate in what has turned out to be a pretty eventful and memorable week. Unfortunately, today's debate is on a deeply partisan and misguided tax bill.

□ 0915

H.R. 5377 would temporarily remove the cap on the deduction for State and local income taxes, property taxes, and sales taxes. The bill also pays for this temporary tax break for a few by permanently increasing the top marginal tax rate.

What is worse, Mr. Speaker, the permanent tax increase isn't limited to individuals but applies to small businesses, as well.

Two years ago, Congress passed and President Trump signed into law the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This monumental legislation not only reformed the corporate tax code to make American business more competitive and

simplified the personal tax code, but it also ensured that the vast majority of Americans are getting to keep more of their hard-earned money than they did 2 years ago. Between lower tax rates, the expanded standard deduction, the child tax credit, and changes to the alternative minimum tax, the benefit of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act are numerous and reach far and wide across the Nation.

Today, the majority is seeking to undo some of that progress and is seeking to push a temporary tax break that will only benefit a few wealthy individuals in a few States. The State and local tax deduction, or SALT deduction, as it is called, primarily benefits only a select group of individuals, generally wealthy people in the top 20 percent of income, in a few high-tax States, who own expensive homes. H.R. 5377 would allow these individuals to temporarily claim an unlimited SALT deduction for only the years 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of this bill will overwhelmingly go to those who are already wealthy. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the top 1 percent of households would receive 56 percent of the benefit of repealing the SALT deduction cap. Let me repeat that: The top 1 percent get 56 percent of the benefits of repealing the SALT deduction cap. The top 5 percent of households will receive over 80 percent of the benefit. Again, let me repeat that: The top 5 percent of income earners in the country are going to get 80 percent of the benefit of this bill. Amazing. The bottom 80 percent of all households would receive precisely 4 percent of the benefit. Amazing.

What is worse, in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we have already acted to offset the reduced SALT deduction by doubling the standard deduction. In the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we doubled the standard deduction from \$12,000 to \$24,000 for married couples, which offset an increase resulting from lowering the SALT deduction cap for a vast majority of taxpayers.

Before TCJA, 30 percent of all taxpayers itemized deductions and could potentially benefit from a SALT deduction. Today, just under 90 percent of all taxpayers take the standard deduction. This has made tax filing significantly easier. More importantly, for our purposes, it has meant that the vast majority of taxpayers who potentially could have benefited from a SALT deduction are already benefiting from the increased standard deduction.

In the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the drafters of the bill made sure that the benefits were spread across all taxpayers. Between doubling the standard deduction, doubling the child tax credit and making it partially refundable, and simplifying the tax code, there is hardly a taxpayer in America who did not see some benefit from the bill.

Here, unlike the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the benefits of H.R. 5377 will go only to a select group of people in a few

key States, and it will overwhelmingly go to people who are already wealthy—already wealthy. Though the majority likes to claim that Republicans only want to cut taxes for the rich, it is ironic that the majority is now pushing a special tax break that literally benefits only the rich.

But the bill is worse than that, Mr. Speaker. To pay for this short-term tax break for a few, the bill also increases the top marginal tax rate for all taxpayers on a permanent basis. That is correct. The bill imposes a permanent tax hike on all Americans to give a short-term tax break for a wealthy few.

That type of tax change simply doesn't make any sense, Mr. Speaker. The tax code does need further reforms, no doubt about it. But those reforms should be those that increase the competitiveness of American business, simplify the tax code further to make it more comprehensible to taxpayers, and ensure further fairness for everyone. Giving a few select people in a few States a short-term and complicated tax break simply doesn't meet these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, school districts across America are struggling to recruit and hire teachers. In the Fourth District of Oklahoma, for example, there are 8,680 teachers who currently receive the education expense deduction. This legislation doubles the above-the-line deduction for educators' out-of-pocket expenses to \$500.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that these teachers would greatly appreciate being able to claim up to \$500 out-of-pocket for the school supplies that they buy for their students.

I want to tell a story from Debra Deskin. Debra is a teacher in Oklahoma, and she has been a faithful public servant for 15 years. She teaches gifted students. She says: "I literally had to choose whether to purchase items for my classroom and students or pay bills. Honestly, the bills get put on the back burner."

These are the type of public servants who this bill is tasked to support to ensure that they are not having to choose between paying their bills or buying supplies for their students.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule reported by the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. I was an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Last Congress, the middle class was targeted by the former House majority. The tax scam law of 2017 remains one of the most destructive bills we have ever seen here because it specifically

went after the middle class. The principal way it did this was by capping the State and local tax, or SALT, deduction, one of the oldest deductions on the books. It existed before the tax code, and there was a reason for it.

This unfair cap hit New Jersey like an anvil dropped from five stories up. The average value of all New Jersey families' deductions was \$19,162 in 2017, a figure double the \$10,000 cap.

But this is not just about New Jersey. The SALT deduction directly benefited more than 46.5 million households, which represents over 100 million Americans. Almost 40 percent of taxpayers earning between \$50,000 and \$75,000 claimed the SALT deduction, and over 70 percent of taxpayers making \$100,000 to \$200,000 used it. Imagine that, that spread over millions of households from coast to coast.

These are families in New Jersey, Illinois, New York, Minnesota, Kentucky, and Texas. They are not all blue States. That is where you made your mistake. You tried to nail us, and you got everybody else paying through the nose to fund a tax cut, which you know went to Big Business and executives, which didn't invest in the government. It didn't invest in this government bill. It didn't invest in industry. It invested in the pockets of shareholders. We know. Look at the data.

When I hold this up at my meetings, your home is worth less than it should be. That has happened all over the country. That is what it has done.

Get rid of all the deductions; see what will happen to charity donations.

Nor is this just a blue-State issue, like some bad faith critics claim. In 2017, the average SALT deduction exceeded \$10,000 in 25 States and the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. At least 10 are so-called red States where the average deduction exceeded \$9,000, including South Carolina, Idaho, Arkansas, and West Virginia.

SALT benefits flow to all communities, like my hometown of Paterson. SALT relief empowers communities to make investments in broadly shared services.

I want to emphasize, this package is fully paid for, so don't give me this malarkey that you are concerned about the poor people, all of a sudden. It is like the Sun coming out in the morning, all of a sudden, and we are concerned about the rich. It doesn't work out that way. It doesn't work out that way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy on this particular bill, noting that the President's advisers would advise him to veto this bill, were it to pass.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5377—RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT—REP. SUOZZI, D-NY, AND 52 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. This legislation would unfairly force all Federal taxpayers to subsidize a tax break for the wealthy, as well as excessive government spending by fiscally irresponsible States. H.R. 5377 would likely cause State and local governments to raise taxes, all while hindering the growth of small businesses and opportunities for workers.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA), which passed Congress without a single Democrat vote, is a signature achievement of the Trump Administration. This bill, which President Donald J. Trump signed into law on December 22, 2017, has spurred economic growth across the Nation by lowering individual tax rates, nearly doubling the standard deduction, simplifying the tax code, and closing special interest loopholes. Workers and middle-class Americans are reaping the benefits of the TCJA in the form of record low unemployment and substantially higher wages. H.R. 5377 would turn back the clock by adding a special interest provision back into the Federal tax code that unfairly requires middle-class Americans to subsidize fiscally irresponsible States and wealthy taxpayers. In doing so, H.R. 5377 would violate the principle that States should raise their own revenue rather than rely on tax subsidies from the Federal Government. The bill would also reduce incentives for States to be fiscally responsible.

Additionally, the provision in H.R. 5377 that would raise the top income tax rate from 37 percent to 39.6 percent would stifle economic growth by placing an undue burden on thousands of small businesses. Because it is unfair to middle-class taxpayers, encourages excessive spending by States, and would stunt economic growth, H.R. 5377 is poor tax policy that should not be enacted into law.

If H.R. 5377 were resented to the President his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody I like better than my friend from New Jersey, quite frankly. We are very good friends. We have worked together on a lot of good things. But I have to tell you, on this one, we just disagree.

The middle class is going to benefit from this bill? Let me just go through the figures again. The top 1 percent of income earners in America get 56 percent of the benefits in this bill. The top 5 percent get 80 percent. The bottom 80 percent get 4 percent.

This is not a middle-class bill. This is not even an upper-middle-class bill. This is a bill for pretty wealthy people. Ninety-six percent of the benefits go to households that make more than \$200,000 a year.

Mr. PASCRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. No, I won't yield. I want to yield to another speaker in a moment. You are the one who raised the issue, so I am just going back to the numbers.

The numbers here are pretty clear. This is a targeted tax cut for wealthy people in a very few States. That is just the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs.

LESKO), my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, most people would think that the most surprising bill to me that we voted on this year was the Articles of Impeachment. Really, that wasn't a surprise to me because I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and since January, we have been doing investigations of President Trump. Many Republicans and I predicted all along that the majority, the Democrats in this House, were going to vote to impeach the President, so it really wasn't a surprise to me.

But this bill really surprises me, and let me tell you why. My goodness, I have served in the Arizona House of Representatives for 6 years and another 3 years in the Arizona Senate. For years, every time the Republican majority would cut taxes so that it would boom the economy and help everyone, my Democratic colleagues then said: "Oh, my gosh, those Republicans, they are just helping the rich. They are just helping the rich. They don't care about the little guy. They don't care about the middle class." The same thing is said for years now, years and years, by my Democratic colleagues and others that: "Oh, those Republicans, they just care about the rich." Oh, baloney.

The tax cut Republicans did in 2017, you can see the effect of those tax cuts. The economy is booming.

□ 0930

There are more job openings than there are jobs to fill them.

This bill is an interesting bill because, in the 2017 tax cut bill that the Republicans put through, it said—you know what—States that are fiscally responsible, that don't have exorbitant property taxes, those constituents in my State of Arizona—

What did you say, sir?

Did you say I was wacko?

Oh, thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, people in Arizona, we are responsible taxpayers. We don't have exorbitant property taxes. I know people who live in New Jersey, and I know how they complain how their property taxes are so incredibly high.

The people in Arizona are fiscally responsible, and that is why people are flocking to our State and other States with low taxes. People in Arizona and other States that are fiscally responsible, they don't want to subsidize the irresponsible States that have high taxes by giving them huge deductions on their Federal taxes.

So, in the Republican tax bill, we capped the deduction at \$10,000. It seems reasonable to me. In fact, the gentleman from New Jersey, I think, just said, recently, the average deduction is \$9,000. Well, that is below \$10,000. That is below the \$10,000 cap, so they can deduct it.

But here in this bill today, Democrats want to raise the cap to \$20,000 and then totally eliminate it in the next 2 years.

When the Republicans put forward amendments, one of the amendments said let's not give this tax break to the top 10 percent of income earners. Democrats rejected it.

Then Republicans had another amendment that said, well, let's not give this big tax break to the top 1 percent income earners. The Democrats rejected it.

So, please, the next time my Democratic colleagues, and Democrats throughout the Nation, when they say it is the Republicans who are always for the rich people, let's look at this bill, because the proof is here. No, it is the Democrats.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Republicans are funding their tax scam bill on the backs of hardworking Americans. The fact is that there is a race to the bottom under their cheating, gerymandering ways.

So, now, the Democrats are in charge in the House. We will continue to work to uphold and bring up our hardworking families.

In Arizona's Eighth Congressional District, there are 9,330 teachers claiming this tax expense deduction. They should know the Democrats stand with them to ensure that they are able to pay their bills, because no one should have to live in poverty because they are standing up for a future generation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative TORRES for yielding me the time and also my good friend from New York, Congressman SUOZZI, for his work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill fixes several alarming defects in President Trump's tax giveaway to the wealthy. It also takes steps to make our tax code fairer for working people.

In 2017, my Republican colleagues tried and failed to eliminate a \$250 tax deduction for teachers buying school supplies for their children in their classrooms.

Smaller education budgets have forced too many teachers to buy supplies to fill the gap. More than 90 percent of public schoolteachers are not reimbursed for these expenses. Nearly 80,000 educators in Maryland claim this deduction on their taxes.

The average teacher spends \$479 of their own money buying supplies for our kids, so I am pleased that this legislation incorporates language from my standalone bill that I filed in the 115th Congress and again in this Congress, the Educators Expense Deduction Modernization Act, which increases the deduction from \$250 to \$500. It is a small benefit for educators who make a financial sacrifice.

It is critical for local school districts and States to better fund education and pay educators. In Congress, we can

do more to ensure classrooms are stocked with the supplies that our students, our children need.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into my prepared remarks, I want to advise my friend that I certainly have no objection to raising the tax credit for teachers or first responders. Those things are, I think, perfectly laudable parts of the bill.

Our main objection is simply that the main benefits of this are going to the top 1 percent and 5 percent of incomes, and that is just indisputable.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 750, a resolution that expresses the sense of the House that it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect and promote individual choice in health insurance for all American people and prevent any Medicare for All proposal that would outlaw private health plans such as the job-based coverage in Medicare Advantage plans.

Earlier this Congress, the House Rules Committee held the first-ever legislative hearing on the Democratic Medicare for All proposal. During that hearing, we heard promises about the Democrat-proposed, one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare system. But we also heard about the realities of that plan: how it would require doubling income and corporate tax rates to implement, how it would lead to long waits for care, and how it would lead to 158 million Americans losing their current coverage.

That is all because Medicare for All, if implemented, would outlaw private healthcare coverage. This includes coverage offered through the popular Medicare Advantage program, which gives 22 million Americans healthcare.

Given that reality, it is wholly appropriate for the House to take this stand now. Protecting individual choice and protecting the private healthcare plans should be a priority for this House.

If we defeat the previous question, we will give every Member of the House an opportunity to say so together, with one voice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with the extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act, which I was proud to cosponsor.

Since 2017, many families in the north county of San Diego and south Orange County communities I represent have taken an unexpected, unfair tax hit. The financial plans they had made, like whether to buy a new home, were upturned when Washington Republicans passed a tax bill that capped the State and local tax deduction.

In my district, more than 58,000 people who make less than \$100,000 per year claimed SALT deductions in 2017, saving \$6,328, on average.

Many of the families in California's 49th District have made serious, long-term financial decisions in recent years based on the expectation that they could take advantage of this significant deduction. Now, because of the Republican tax bill and the SALT cap that placed new limits on those deductions, their financial plans are being turned upside down. That is why I am glad that we are voting on legislation to restore the SALT deduction.

The House is doing its part. Now Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL needs to do what is right and bring this bipartisan bill up for hearings and a vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just to quickly respond to my friend, I would remind the gentleman that Republicans offered, in committee, an amendment which would have, frankly, given the SALT deduction to the bottom 90 percent of all Americans in exchange for continuing to charge it on the top 10 percent. I suspect that would cover the vast majority of the gentleman's constituents who might benefit.

I also remind everybody that the standard deduction was double, so, for most people, the average person actually came out ahead. It is only the very wealthy people who lost ground under this particular measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN), a distinguished former general.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to just say today that I live in the State of Tennessee, and in Tennessee, we are a fiscally responsible State. We have the lowest per capita debt in the Nation. We have no income tax at all. We have no investment income tax.

When a State has superhigh taxes and you allow individuals to write that tax off, it is unfair to those well-managed States like Tennessee that don't tax our people as much.

So, when you raise caps or you raise deductions, those States that are poorly managed, those States that are high-tax States to their individuals are subsidized by the people in Tennessee. We wind up paying more tax so that those States that are poorly managed can pay less.

To say, oh, we have got to do this for the low-income individuals out there, well, how about those States just man-

age themselves better, tax their people less, and then there wouldn't be an issue? Why should the people of Tennessee have to subsidize States that can't manage themselves?

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct, for the record, about the 2017 Republican tax scam.

We have heard today, during this debate, that these tax cuts boosted our economy, and that simply isn't the case.

I include in the RECORD an article from Forbes titled: "The 2017 Tax Cuts Didn't Work, the Data Prove It."

[From Forbes, May 30, 2019]

THE 2017 TAX CUTS DIDN'T WORK, THE DATA PROVE IT

(By Christian Weller)

The independent, non-partisan Congressional Research Service just released a report showing that the 2017 tax cuts for the richest Americans and corporations did not work. This confirms what anybody who has been looking at the data already knew. Investment did not boom and workers will not see the promised bump in pay. Instead, the federal government incurred massive deficits while wealth inequality increased to its highest level in three decades.

Republicans in Congress and President Trump touted the benefits of Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 as game changing. Showing the richest Americans and corporations even more money was supposed to lead to more business investments. These investments, the argument went, would translate into more productivity growth. Workers would then supposedly see an additional \$4,000 per year in wages. And faster economic growth and higher wages would result in more tax revenue, thus paying mainly for itself.

These were empty promises. Businesses did not use the windfall of new cash to invest in new machines, technology, office parks and manufacturing plants. Without an acceleration in business investment, though, American workers will not see the bumps in pay promised over the longer term. The richest Americans instead got even richer while corporations used a lot of the new money to keep shareholders happy. Federal budget deficits quickly ballooned because there was no faster growth and more revenue to offset the hundreds of billions lost each year to the predictably wasteful tax cuts.

The core of the argument in favor of the tax cuts was that they would result in more investment. The main measure is business investment that goes beyond replacing obsolete equipment and buildings—so-called net non-residential fixed investment. As share of gross domestic product (GDP), net investment reached a low of 2.8% in the first quarter of 2016 (see figure below). It grew afterwards until the tax cuts were passed in late 2017 and eventually levelled off rather than accelerating in mid-2018. Consequently, net investment as share of GDP stayed below its levels in 2014. The tax cuts did not accelerate investment as promised by supply-side advocates.

But maybe the tax cuts boosted growth in other ways? In theory, the tax cuts could have created some additional demand that resulted in people spending more money, which would then have led businesses to also increase its spending. To capture this, an economic measure needs to strip out parts of the economy from GDP that are not affected

by tax cuts. These parts include inventory investment—material that is produced but sits on shelves—government consumption on salaries and supplies, and net exports—the difference between exports and imports. The resulting key measure are so-called private domestic final purchases (PDFP).

The tax cuts did not lead to faster private activity. PDFP increased by 3.3% from December 2016 to December 2017, before Congress passed the tax cuts. Afterwards, year-over-year growth remained at or below that level, actually declining since September 2018. This deceleration is yet another clear indictment of the tax cuts' ineffectiveness.

But didn't GDP growth accelerate? Not only does GDP growth capture parts of the economy that clearly were not affected by the tax cuts, the data also show no acceleration there, either. GDP growth started to get faster from low of 1.3% in June 2016 and continued to gain strength through 2018 (see Figure above). But year-over-year growth in 2018 stayed below the levels shown in early 2015.

The money from the tax cuts obviously went somewhere, just not to investments or workers' wages. Corporations just decided to use their additional cash to keep their shareholders happy. Non-financial corporations used most of their after-tax profits since the tax cuts went into effect to buy back their own shares and pay out dividends. When a firm buys back its own shares, the remaining shares become more valuable and the company's stock price goes up, increasing the wealth of shareholders, mainly people who are already very wealthy. CEOs in particular gained from buybacks since their compensation typically depends on the price of a company's stock. In 2018, corporations spent about two-thirds of their after-tax profits on buying back their own shares and paying out dividends, according to Fed data. By the fourth quarter of 2018, corporations spent 107.7% of after-tax profits on dividends and share repurchases.

This was good news for the wealthiest few. The top one percent of wealthiest households owned a record high share of all wealth by the middle of 2018 (see figure below).

At the same time, federal budget deficits rapidly jumped. After falling precipitously in the immediate aftermath of the Great Recession, the deficits quickly grew again in 2018 (see figure below). The increase in deficits was driven heavily by a sharp drop in corporate tax revenue—not surprisingly, given the massive corporate tax cuts in the legislation.

did not accelerate, but wealth inequality grew. The American tax payers are now getting stuck with the bill, while they did not see many benefits from this trillion dollar boondoggle.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD another article, and this one is from CNBC, titled: "Trump Tax Cuts Did Little to Boost Economic Growth in 2018, Study Says."

[From CNBC, May 29, 2019]

TRUMP TAX CUTS DID LITTLE TO BOOST ECONOMIC GROWTH IN 2018, STUDY SAYS
(By Jeff Cox)

An in-depth look by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service indicated that not only did the rollbacks in business and personal rates have little macro impact, but they also delivered the most benefits to corporations and the rich, with little boost to wages.

In all, GDP rose 2.9% for the full calendar year, the best performance since the financial crisis. But that came in an economy already poised to move higher, economists Jane Gravelle and Donald Marples wrote.

"On the whole, the growth effects [from the cuts] tend to show a relatively small (if any) first-year effect on the economy," the report said. "Although examining the growth rates cannot indicate the effects of the tax cut on GDP, it does tend to rule out very large effects in the near term."

Trump had touted the cuts as a key step toward generating GDP growth of at least 3%. The legislation, passed in late 2017, slashed corporate tax rates from 35% to 21%, reduced the number of brackets, lowered rates for many individual payers, and doubled the standard deduction in an effort to make most income tax-exempt for the lowest earners.

Employment continued to boom in 2018 and average hourly earnings have in recent months passed 3% on a year-over-year basis for the first time since the recovery began in 2009. However, the economists said wage gains could not be tracked to the tax cuts.

"This growth is smaller than overall growth in labor compensation and indicates that ordinary workers had very little growth in wage rates," the economists wrote.

The study indicated that the tax changes contributed only marginally to the overall economic gains—maybe 0.3% of a "feedback effect." The economists say that for the tax cuts to pay for themselves, as Trump has promised, GDP would have to rise by 6.7%.

"The initial effect of a demand side is likely to be reflected in increased consumption and the data indicate little growth in consumption in 2018," the report said. "Much of the tax cut was directed at businesses and higher-income individuals who are less likely to spend. Fiscal stimulus is limited in an economy that is at or near full employment."

At the same time, tax receipts from 2018 indicate that corporations got an even bigger break than expected.

While the Congressional Budget Office had forecast a \$94 billion break that still would have generated \$243 billion in corporate revenues, the actual total was \$205 billion, or 16% lower than projected.

The effective tax for corporations, or the level they pay after taxes, was 17.2% in the year before the tax breaks took hold and plunged to 8.8% for 2018. Individuals, meanwhile, saw a drop from 9.6% as a percentage of personal income in 2017 to 9.2% last year.

Bonuses from those companies also didn't amount to much when averaged across all workers, with the \$4.4 billion paid coming to just \$28 per employee in the U.S.

Companies also received incentives to repatriate profits held overseas, and they did so to the tune of \$664 billion. While companies bought back about \$1 trillion of their own shares, "the evidence does not suggest a surge in investment from abroad in 2018," the report said.

The White House did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to speak today on the rule, but I am just so outraged when I hear people attacking States like mine and other States.

My State, the State of New York, is the largest single net donor to the Federal Government of any State in the United States of America. We send \$48 billion a year more to the Federal Government than we get back. And to hear this talk about irresponsible States that are really subsidizing these other

States of the speakers who have spoken from the other side today is just so irresponsible and so divisive in our Nation.

We talk about this bill, about restoring tax fairness, that is exactly what it is: tax fairness.

It is not fair that people are taxed on the taxes they have already paid.

It is not fair that State and local governments who pick up the garbage and plow the roads and protect our people and educate our children are being forced to have to worry about more money being used to subsidize the rest of the country.

It is not fair that this has been in place since 1913, and they want to try and change this covenant that has existed since the beginning of the Federal tax code. They want to change it at this time, and it is completely unfair.

Let me point out, with one last point, that 100 percent of this bill is paid for by the highest earners in the United States of America. One hundred percent is paid for by the highest earners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SUOZZI. If my colleagues are concerned about the wealthy getting too much, then have them increase the progressive tax even higher if that is what they really mean.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, nobody admires my friend from New York more than I do. We worked on a number of issues. But let's be real. Democrats are going to make the rich, I guess, in every State pay for the rich in your own State. That is just the fact.

□ 0945

Most of the benefit of this thing—56 percent of the benefits—goes to the top 1 percent of income earners. That is the fact. Eighty percent of it goes to the top 5 percent, and 94 percent goes to households that make over \$200,000 a year. Those are just the numbers.

Now, some of this is used for worthy causes. I would agree with that. But a permanent tax increase for a temporary tax cut, frankly, just doesn't make a lot of sense, and that is what we are dealing with here.

So I would also suggest that my friends remember that the tax cut that they revile so much doubles the personal exemption for most people so that more than offsets for most people the SALT tax reduction that was reduced. It is not eliminated; it is still there.

Mr. Speaker, \$10,000 a year is still a pretty good deduction to be able to take. If you make that much income that you can take a deduction that large, then you are probably doing pretty well.

So, again, I don't have any problem with people defending the interest of

their States, that is a perfectly appropriate thing to do. I don't have any problem with people wanting to use money for good purposes. That is a perfectly appropriate thing to do. But let's be real about who is getting the benefit of this tax package, and it is very-high-income people.

In fact, I am going to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I won't take a full minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first start by saying how much I respect and admire Mr. COLE, and I have worked closely with him on many issues.

I just want to make one point, though. So many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been boasting about the fact that people are leaving States like mine to move to their States. That has been one of the effects of this tax bill by eliminating the State and local tax cap.

What happens when people leave my State and move to the Southwest or the Southeast?

They leave behind lower- and middle-income-tax people to pick up the bill.

They are trying to boast about the fact that our States, which are mature, industrial States that have old roads, old bridges, old sewers, old schools, and old hospitals, when we get money from the Federal Government, we have got to fix up those legacy issues. We have got to deal with pockets of poverty because we have been around for a longer time.

Their States are growing when they get money from us. We are subsidizing the rest of the country.

When they get money from the Federal Government, what are they using it for?

New sewers, new roads, new bridges, new hospitals, and new schools. They are growing, and they are bringing in new sales and new property taxes. They are trying to take credit for it when really it is because of the progressive income tax and the money that has come from our States that has helped their States to succeed. It is hypocrisy to suggest that our States are somehow irresponsible. It is hypocrisy to suggest that they are concerned about the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend I am prepared to close whenever she is. In the interim, I will reserve if she has more speakers.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close also.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I oppose both the rule and the underlying measure. H.R. 5377 is a deeply misguided and partisan tax bill that sets up a temporary tax break for a privileged few and seeks to trade it for a permanent tax hike for the entire country.

The bill temporarily removes the cap on the State and local tax deduction, a benefit that will primarily go to wealthy taxpayers living in expensive homes in a few key States and localities. But to pay for this temporary boondoggle, the majority is adding a permanent hike at the top marginal tax rate. The benefits will go only to a few key privileged areas, but the costs are spread across the entire country.

It makes very little sense to me to trade a temporary tax break for a permanent tax increase, and it makes even less sense to me to ask the entire country to pay for it in perpetuity for a short-term tax break for a few areas with high State and local taxes.

Now, my friends have talked about the relative tax burden and who gives what and what States give what. As a former member of the Budget Committee, those numbers are, by the way, usually based on the discretionary portion of the budget. The reality is—I hate to say this, because we have a big problem in front of us that I don't think either party has confronted very well, certainly not mine, but I don't think my friends have either, and I don't think this administration has, and I don't think the last one did—every State in America is a debtor State if you start adding in Medicare, Medicaid, and those type of nondiscretionary expenditures.

So we have a big problem. It is really related to an aging population more than it is anything else, but the idea that some States are so-called donor States, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, nobody is a donor State in America. We are running nearly a \$1 trillion deficit. That deficit comes almost primarily because we have simply not readjusted Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security to pay for the benefits that are drawn out. I hope someday we will work on that.

I actually have a bipartisan bill, I used to carry it with Mr. Delaney—a very good friend and Presidential candidate from my good friends on the other side—that would go back and set up what we did in 1983. When Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill worked together, we had a Social Security Commission. We actually increased the revenue going into Social Security. I think that would have to be one of the long-term fixes, not simply cuts, reductions, and reforms. That is a debate for another day.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers, in my view, deserve better than what is in front of us here today. Rather than making the tax code more regressive and complicated, which this bill would do, we should further reform and simplify the tax code to make it easier for all taxpayers to understand. We should be making American businesses more competitive, and we should be taking steps so that American workers can keep more of their hard-earned income, something I know we all want to do.

In closing, again, just remember this: 56 percent of the benefits of this bill go

to the top 1 percent of income earners. The top 5 percent get 80 percent, and the bottom 80 percent in terms of income get 4 percent. That should explain it all and why we should reject this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, “no” on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by clarifying a misconception that all of these taxes are forced upon taxpayers. This last election cycle local voters voted to tax themselves to pay for affordable housing for our growing homeless population, to pay for improved roads, and to pay for better water quality. So they should not be punished for filling the gap where the Federal Government has failed to do so. This bill is paid for by raising taxes for households making over \$400,000, back to the levels before Republicans passed their tax scam bill.

California pays \$13 billion more in Federal taxes than it received from the Federal Government according to a 2016 IRS report. Tennessee is the third most dependent State on Federal resources. So to argue here that we should punish the people for wanting to help provide for your constituents because you failed to do that is outrageous. Oklahoma received \$7.5 billion in Federal funding in 2016. This bill is not about subsidizing those who already have too much. This bill is about stopping the double taxation on the same dollar.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to try to give the middle-class families a break and undo the damage caused by the Republican tax scam. As we look forward to the new year, I want to take a minute to reflect on the work Democrats in Congress have done during this 116th Congress.

Whereas, the Republican tax law provided seven drug companies \$34 billion in tax cuts in 1 year alone, last week, Democrats passed H.R. 3 to help seniors and American families afford their prescription drugs.

Whereas, last January the President caused the longest government shutdown in history by pushing to irresponsibly use taxpayer dollars for an unnecessary border wall, Democrats have fought for comprehensive funding bills that invest in our infrastructure, healthcare, national security, and to increase the Federal minimum wage.

Whereas, the Republican tax scam led to America's 400 wealthiest people paying a much lower tax rate than the working class, Democrats are here today because we believe in the middle class.

Repealing the cap on the State and local tax deductions will benefit taxpayers across our Nation. I have heard my colleagues claim that this bill is for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues remember voting on the largest tax giveaway to the rich and corporations in American history?

Obviously, they don't. But I am here to remind them that the biggest beneficiaries of the tax law that they passed were billionaires. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that wealthy taxpayers making \$1 million or higher received a tax cut of \$37 billion in 2019.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican tax scam was a bill for the megarich, H.R. 5377 is legislation for constituents like mine, working-class Americans. The cap on SALT deductions is bad for my constituents.

The average Californian pays over \$18,000 in State and local taxes, which is almost double over the SALT cap, again, to help improve the quality of life of the fifth largest economy in the world, which no other State can claim. As a result, 1 million Californians will pay \$12 billion more in taxes into the SALT cap.

In 2016 my constituents deducted almost \$700 million in State and local taxes from their Federal taxes.

It is time to give them a break and give them back the deductions that they once had. No one should have to pay taxes twice on the same dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for the rule and passage of H.R. 5377, Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and a "yes" vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 772

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 750) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that individual choice in health insurance should be protected. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 750.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 697]

YEAS—227

Adams	Golden	Omar
Aguilar	Gomez	Pallone
Allred	Gonzalez (TX)	Panetta
Axne	Gottheimer	Pappas
Barragán	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarell
Bass	Grijalva	Payne
Bera	Haaland	Perlmutter
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Peterson
Blumenauer	Hayes	Phillips
Blunt Rochester	Heck	Pingree
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Himes	Porter
Brindisi	Horn, Kendra S.	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Horsford	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Houlahan	Raskin
Bustos	Hoyer	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Huffman	Richmond
Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Rose (NY)
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Rouda
Carlson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Ruiz
Case	Johnson (TX)	Ruppersberger
Casten (IL)	Keating	Rush
Castor (FL)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan
Castro (TX)	Kennedy	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Khan	Sarbanes
Cicilline	Kildee	Scanlon
Cisneros	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clark (MA)	Kim	Schiff
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schneider
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Clyburn	Kuster (NH)	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Lamb	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Shalala
Correa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lawrence	Sherrill
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Sires
Cox (CA)	Lee (CA)	Slotkin
Craig	Lee (NV)	Smith (WA)
Crist	Levin (CA)	Soto
Crow	Levin (MI)	Spanberger
Cuellar	Lewis	Speier
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Stevens
Davis (CA)	Loeb	Suozzi
Davis, Danny K.	Loeb	Swalwell (CA)
Dean	Lowey	Takano
DeFazio	Lujan	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Luria	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lynch	Titus
DelBene	Malinowski	Tlaib
Delgado	Maloney	Tonko
Demings	Carolyn B.	Torres (CA)
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Torres Small
Deutch	Matsui	(NM)
Dingell	McAdams	Trahan
Doggett	McBath	Trone
Doyle, Michael F.	McCollum	Underwood
Engel	McGovern	Van Drew
Escobar	McNerney	Vargas
Eshoo	Meeks	Veasey
Español	Meng	Vela
Evans	Moore	Velázquez
Finkenauer	Morelle	Visclosky
Fletcher	Moulton	Wasserman
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Schultz
Frankel	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Fudge	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Gabbard	Napolitano	Welch
Gallego	Neal	Weston
Garamendi	Neguse	Wild
García (IL)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
García (TX)	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
	Ocasio-Cortez	

NAYS—195

Abraham	Barr	Bucshon
Aderholt	Bergman	Budd
Allen	Biggs	Burchett
Amodei	Billirakis	Burgess
Armstrong	Bishop (NC)	Byrne
Arrington	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Babin	Bost	Carter (GA)
Bacon	Brady	Carter (TX)
Baird	Brooks (AL)	Chabot
Balderson	Brooks (IN)	Cheney
Banks	Buchanan	Cline
	Buck	Cloud

Cole	Johnson (LA)	Roby
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
Comer	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.
Conaway	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cook	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Crenshaw	Katko	Rose, John W.
Curtis	Keller	Rouzer
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Scalise
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Schweikert
Duncan	Kinzing	Scott, Austin
Dunn	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Emmer	LaHood	Simpson
Estes	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Ferguson	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Fleischmann	Lesko	Smucker
Flores	Long	Spano
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Stauber
Fox (NC)	Lucas	Stefanik
Fulcher	Luetkemeyer	Steil
Gaetz	Marshall	Steube
Gallagher	Massie	Stewart
Gianforte	Mast	Stivers
Gibbs	McCarthy	Taylor
Gohmert	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Gonzalez (OH)	McClintock	Thornberry
Gooden	McHenry	Timmons
Gosar	McKinley	Tipton
Granger	Meadows	Turner
Graves (GA)	Meuser	Upton
Graves (LA)	Miller	Wagner
Graves (MO)	Mitchell	Walberg
Green (TN)	Moolenaar	Walden
Griffith	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Grothman	Mullin	Walorski
Guest	Murphy (NC)	Waltz
Guthrie	Newhouse	Watkins
Hagedorn	Norman	Weber (TX)
Harris	Nunes	Webster (FL)
Hartzer	Olson	Wenstrup
Hern, Kevin	Palazzo	Westerman
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Williams
Hice (GA)	Pence	Wilson (SC)
Higgins (LA)	Perry	Wittman
Hill (AR)	Posey	Womack
Holding	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Hollingsworth	Reed	Wright
Hudson	Reschenthaler	Yoho
Huizenga	Rice (SC)	Young
Hurd (TX)	Riggleman	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Beatty	Marchant	Serrano
Hunter	McEachin	Shimkus
Kaptur	Pressley	

□ 1024

Mr. MCCARTHY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. THOMPSON of Mississippi and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 697.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 698]

YEAS—227

Adams	Axne	Beatty
Aguilar	Barragán	Bera
Allred	Bass	Beyer

Bishop (GA) Haaland
 Blumenauer Harder (CA)
 Blunt Rochester Hastings
 Bonamici Hayes
 Boyle, Brendan Heck
 F. Higgins (NY)
 Brindisi Himes
 Brown (MD) Horn, Kendra S.
 Brownley (CA) Horsford
 Bustos Houlihan
 Butterfield Hoyer
 Carbajal Huffman
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee
 Carson (IN) Jayapal
 Cartwright Jeffries
 Case Johnson (GA)
 Casten (IL) Johnson (TX)
 Castor (FL) Kaptur
 Castro (TX) Keating
 Chu, Judy Kelly (IL)
 Cicilline Kennedy
 Cisneros Khanna
 Clark (MA) Kildee
 Clarke (NY) Kilmer
 Clay Kim
 Cleaver Kind
 Clyburn Kirkpatrick
 Cohen Krishnamoorthi
 Connolly Kuster (NH)
 Cooper Lamb
 Correa Langevin
 Costa Larsen (WA)
 Courtney Larson (CT)
 Cox (CA) Lawrence
 Craig Lawson (FL)
 Crist Lee (CA)
 Crow Lee (NV)
 Cuellar Levin (CA)
 Cunningham Levin (MI)
 Davids (KS) Lewis
 Davis (CA) Lieu, Ted
 Davis, Danny K. Lipinski
 Dean Loebsock
 DeFazio Lofgren
 DeGette Lowenthal
 DeLauro Lujan
 DelBene Luria
 Delgado Lynch
 Demings Malinowski
 DeSaulnier Maloney,
 Deutch Carolyn B.
 Dingell Maloney, Sean
 Doggett Matsui
 Doyle, Michael F. McBath
 Engel McCollum
 Escobar McGovern
 Eshoo McNeerney
 Espallat Meeks
 Evans Meng
 Finkenauer Moore
 Fletcher Morelle
 Foster Moulton
 Frankel Mucarsel-Powell
 Fudge Murphy (FL)
 Gabbard Nadler
 Gallego Napolitano
 Garamendi Neal
 Garcia (IL) Neguse
 Garcia (TX) Norcross
 Gomez O'Halleran
 Gonzalez (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
 Gottheimer Omar
 Green, Al (TX) Pallone
 Grijalva Panetta

NAYS—196

Abraham Buchanan
 Aderholt Buck
 Allen Bucsosh
 Amash Budd
 Amodei Burchett
 Armstrong Burgess
 Arrington Byrne
 Babin Calvert
 Bacon Carter (GA)
 Baird Carter (TX)
 Balderson Chabot
 Banks Cheney
 Barr Cline
 Bergman Cloud
 Biggs Cole
 Bilirakis Collins (GA)
 Bishop (NC) Comer
 Bishop (UT) Conaway
 Bost Cook
 Brady Crawford
 Brooks (AL) Crenshaw
 Brooks (IN) Curtis

Pappas
 Pascarell
 Payne
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Phillips
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Porter
 Pressley
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Rose (NY)
 Rouda
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan
 Sánchez
 Sarbanes
 Scanlon
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Schrier
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Sewell (AL)
 Shalala
 Sherman
 Sherrill
 Sires
 Slotkin
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Spanberger
 Speier
 Stevens
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tlaib
 Tonko
 Torres (CA)
 Torres Small
 (NM)
 Trahan
 Trone
 Underwood
 Van Drew
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wexton
 Wild
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

Gooden
 Gosar
 Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Green (TN)
 Griffith
 Grothman
 Guest
 Guthrie
 Hagedorn
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hern, Kevin
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice (GA)
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill (AR)
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Huizenga
 Hurd (TX)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson (SD)
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Joyce (PA)
 Katko
 Keller
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kintzinger
 Kustoff (TN)
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Latta
 Lesko
 Long
 Loudermilk

Hudson
 Hunter
 Marchant

Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 McAdams
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 Meadows
 Meuser
 Miller
 Mitchell
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Murphy (NC)
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Pence
 Perry
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reschenthaler
 Rice (SC)
 Riggelman
 Roby
 Rodgers (WA)
 Roe, David P.
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rooney (FL)
 Rose, John W.
 Rouzer
 Roy
 Rutherford
 Scalise

NOT VOTING—7

McEachin
 Serrano
 Shimkus

Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smucker
 Spano
 Stauber
 Stefanik
 Steil
 Steube
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Timmons
 Tipton
 Turner
 Upton
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Waltz
 Watkins
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Wright
 Yoho
 Young
 Zeldin

Stanton

□ 1035

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 698.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of December 16, 2019, I call up the bill (H.R. 5430) to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico). Pursuant to the order of the House of December 16, 2019, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

Sec. 2. Purpose.

Sec. 3. Definitions.

TITLE I—APPROVAL OF, AND GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO, THE USMCA

Sec. 101. Approval and entry into force of the USMCA.

Sec. 102. Relationship of the USMCA to United States and State law.

Sec. 103. Implementing actions in anticipation of entry into force; initial regulations; tariff proclamation authority.

Sec. 104. Consultation and layover provisions for, and effective date of, proclaimed actions.

Sec. 105. Administration of dispute settlement proceedings.

Sec. 106. Trade Representative authority.

Sec. 107. Effective date.

TITLE II—CUSTOMS PROVISIONS

Sec. 201. Exclusion of originating goods of USMCA countries from special agriculture safeguard authority.

Sec. 202. Rules of origin.

Sec. 202A. Special rules for automotive goods.

Sec. 203. Merchandise processing fee.

Sec. 204. Disclosure of incorrect information; false certifications of origin; denial of preferential tariff treatment.

Sec. 205. Reliquidation of entries.

Sec. 206. Recordkeeping requirements.

Sec. 207. Actions regarding verification of claims under the USMCA.

Sec. 208. Drawback [reserved].

Sec. 209. Other amendments to the Tariff Act of 1930.

Sec. 210. Regulations.

TITLE III—APPLICATION OF USMCA TO SECTORS AND SERVICES

Subtitle A—Relief From Injury Caused by Import Competition [reserved]

Subtitle B—Temporary Entry of Business Persons [reserved]

Subtitle C—United States-Mexico Cross-border Long-haul Trucking Services

Sec. 321. Definitions.

Sec. 322. Investigations and determinations by Commission.

Sec. 323. Commission recommendations and report.

Sec. 324. Action by President with respect to affirmative determination.

Sec. 325. Confidential business information.

Sec. 326. Conforming amendments.

Sec. 327. Survey of operating authorities.

TITLE IV—ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

Subtitle A—Preventing Duty Evasion

Sec. 401. Cooperation on duty evasion.

Subtitle B—Dispute Settlement [reserved]

Subtitle C—Conforming Amendments

Sec. 421. Judicial review in antidumping duty and countervailing duty cases.

Sec. 422. Conforming amendments to other provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930.

Sec. 423. Conforming amendments to title 28, United States Code.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

Sec. 431. Effect of termination of USMCA country status.

Sec. 432. Effective date.

TITLE V—TRANSFER PROVISIONS AND OTHER AMENDMENTS

Sec. 501. Drawback.

Sec. 502. Relief from injury caused by import competition.

Sec. 503. Temporary entry.
 Sec. 504. Dispute settlement in antidumping and countervailing duty cases.
 Sec. 505. Government procurement.
 Sec. 506. Actions affecting United States cultural industries.
 Sec. 507. Regulatory treatment of uranium purchases.
 Sec. 508. Report on amendments to existing law.

TITLE VI—TRANSITION TO AND EXTENSION OF USMCA

Subtitle A—Transitional Provisions

Sec. 601. Repeal of North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.
 Sec. 602. Continued suspension of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement.

Subtitle B—Joint Reviews Regarding Extension of USMCA

Sec. 611. Participation in joint reviews with Canada and Mexico regarding extension of the term of the USMCA and other action regarding the USMCA.

Subtitle C—Termination of USMCA

Sec. 621. Termination of USMCA.

TITLE VII—LABOR MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 701. Definitions.

Subtitle A—Interagency Labor Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement

Sec. 711. Interagency labor committee for monitoring and enforcement.
 Sec. 712. Duties.
 Sec. 713. Enforcement priorities.
 Sec. 714. Assessments.
 Sec. 715. Recommendation for enforcement action.
 Sec. 716. Petition process.
 Sec. 717. Hotline.
 Sec. 718. Reports.
 Sec. 719. Consultations on appointment and funding of rapid response labor panelists.

Subtitle B—Mexico Labor Attachés

Sec. 721. Establishment.
 Sec. 722. Duties.
 Sec. 723. Status.

Subtitle C—Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board

Sec. 731. Establishment.
 Sec. 732. Membership; term.
 Sec. 733. Funding.
 Sec. 734. Reports.

Subtitle D—Forced Labor

Sec. 741. Forced labor enforcement task force.
 Sec. 742. Timeline required.
 Sec. 743. Reports required.
 Sec. 744. Duties related to Mexico.

Subtitle E—Enforcement Under Rapid Response Labor Mechanism

Sec. 751. Transmission of reports.
 Sec. 752. Suspension of liquidation.
 Sec. 753. Final remedies.

TITLE VIII—ENVIRONMENT MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 801. Definitions.

Subtitle A—Interagency Environment Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement

Sec. 811. Establishment.
 Sec. 812. Assessment.
 Sec. 813. Monitoring actions.
 Sec. 814. Enforcement actions.
 Sec. 815. Other monitoring and enforcement actions.
 Sec. 816. Report to Congress.
 Sec. 817. Regulations.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

Sec. 821. Border water infrastructure improvement authority.

Sec. 822. Detail of personnel to Office of the United States Trade Representative.

Subtitle C—North American Development Bank

Sec. 831. General capital increase.
 Sec. 832. Policy goals.
 Sec. 833. Efficiencies and streamlining.
 Sec. 834. Performance measures.

TITLE IX—USMCA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to approve and implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada entered into under the authority of section 103(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4202(b)).

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) **HTS.**—The term “HTS” means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(3) **IDENTICAL GOODS.**—The term “identical goods” means goods that are the same in all respects relevant to the rule of origin that qualifies the goods as originating goods.

(4) **INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—The term “International Trade Commission” means the United States International Trade Commission.

(5) **MEXICO.**—The term “Mexico” means the United Mexican States.

(6) **NAFTA.**—The term “NAFTA” means the North American Free Trade Agreement approved by Congress under section 101(a)(1) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3311(a)(1)).

(7) **PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.**—The term “preferential tariff treatment” means the customs duty rate that is applicable to an originating good (as defined in section 202(a)) under the USMCA.

(8) **TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.**—The term “Trade Representative” means the United States Trade Representative.

(9) **USMCA.**—The term “USMCA” means the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, which is—

(A) attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement with the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, done at Buenos Aires on November 30, 2018, as amended by the Protocol of Amendment to the Agreement Between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, done at Mexico City on December 10, 2019; and

(B) approved by Congress under section 101(a)(1).

(10) **USMCA COUNTRY.**—Except as otherwise provided, the term “USMCA country” means—

(A) Canada for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to, and the United States applies the USMCA to, Canada; and

(B) Mexico for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to, and the United States applies the USMCA to, Mexico.

TITLE I—APPROVAL OF, AND GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO, THE USMCA

SEC. 101. APPROVAL AND ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE USMCA.

(a) **APPROVAL OF USMCA AND STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION.**—Pursuant to section 106 of the Bipartisan Congressional

Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4205) and section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191), Congress approves—

(1) the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement with the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, done at Buenos Aires on November 30, 2018, as submitted to Congress on December 13, 2019;

(2) the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, attached as an Annex to the Protocol, as amended by the Protocol of Amendment to the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada, done at Mexico City on December 10, 2019, as submitted to Congress on December 13, 2019; and

(3) the statement of administrative action proposed to implement that Agreement, as submitted to Congress on December 13, 2019.

(b) **CONDITIONS FOR ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE AGREEMENT.**—The President is authorized to provide for the USMCA to enter into force with respect to Canada and Mexico not earlier than 30 days after the date on which the President submits to Congress the written notice required by section 106(a)(1)(G) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4205(a)(1)(G)), which shall include the date on which the USMCA will enter into force.

SEC. 102. RELATIONSHIP OF THE USMCA TO UNITED STATES AND STATE LAW.

(a) **RELATIONSHIP OF USMCA TO UNITED STATES LAW.**—

(1) **UNITED STATES LAW TO PREVAIL IN CONFLICT.**—No provision of the USMCA, nor the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance, which is inconsistent with any law of the United States, shall have effect.

(2) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(A) to amend or modify any law of the United States, or

(B) to limit any authority conferred under any law of the United States, unless specifically provided for in this Act.

(b) **RELATIONSHIP OF USMCA TO STATE LAW.**—

(1) **LEGAL CHALLENGE.**—No State law, or the application thereof, may be declared invalid as to any person or circumstance on the ground that the provision or application is inconsistent with the USMCA, except in an action brought by the United States for the purpose of declaring such law or application invalid.

(2) **DEFINITION OF STATE LAW.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “State law” includes—

(A) any law of a political subdivision of a State; and

(B) any State law regulating or taxing the business of insurance.

(c) **EFFECT OF USMCA WITH RESPECT TO PRIVATE REMEDIES.**—No person other than the United States—

(1) shall have any cause of action or defense under the USMCA or by virtue of congressional approval thereof; or

(2) may challenge, in any action brought under any provision of law, any action or inaction by any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States, any State, or any political subdivision of a State, on the ground that such action or inaction is inconsistent with the USMCA.

SEC. 103. IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS IN ANTICIPATION OF ENTRY INTO FORCE; INITIAL REGULATIONS; TARIFF PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY.

(a) **IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS.**—

(1) **PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY.**—After the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) the President may proclaim such actions, and

(B) other appropriate officers of the United States Government may prescribe such regulations, as may be necessary to ensure that any provision of this Act, or amendment made by this Act, that takes effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force is appropriately implemented on such date, but no such proclamation or regulation may have an effective date earlier than the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN PROCLAIMED ACTIONS.**—Any action proclaimed by the President under the authority of this Act that is not subject to the consultation and layover provisions under section 104 may not take effect before the 15th day after the date on which the text of the proclamation is published in the Federal Register.

(3) **WAIVER OF 15-DAY RESTRICTION.**—The 15-day restriction contained in paragraph (2) on the taking effect of proclaimed actions is waived to the extent that the application of such restriction would prevent the taking effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force of any action proclaimed under this section.

(b) **INITIAL REGULATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided by paragraph (2) or (3), initial regulations necessary or appropriate to carry out the actions required by or authorized under this Act or proposed in the statement of administrative action approved under section 101(a)(2) to implement the USMCA shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be prescribed within 1 year after the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(2) **UNIFORM REGULATIONS.**—Interim or initial regulations to implement the Uniform Regulations regarding rules of origin provided for under article 5.16 of the USMCA shall be prescribed not later than the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(3) **IMPLEMENTING ACTIONS WITH EFFECTIVE DATES AFTER ENTRY INTO FORCE.**—In the case of any implementing action that takes effect on a date after the date on which the USMCA enters into force, initial regulations to carry out that action shall, to the maximum extent feasible, be prescribed within 1 year after such effective date.

(c) **TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.**—

(1) **TARIFF MODIFICATIONS PROVIDED FOR IN THE USMCA.**—The President may proclaim—

(A) such modifications or continuation of any duty,

(B) such continuation of duty-free or excise treatment, or

(C) such additional duties, as the President determines to be necessary or appropriate to carry out or apply articles 2.4, 2.5, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 6.2, and 6.3, the Schedule of the United States to Annex 2-B, including the appendices to that Annex, Annex 2-C, and Annex 6-A, of the USMCA.

(2) **OTHER TARIFF MODIFICATIONS.**—Subject to the consultation and layover provisions of section 104, the President may proclaim—

(A) such modifications or continuation of any duty,

(B) such modifications as the United States may agree to with a USMCA country regarding the staging of any duty treatment set forth in the Schedule of the United States to Annex 2-B of the USMCA, including the appendices to that Annex,

(C) such continuation of duty-free or excise treatment, or

(D) such additional duties, as the President determines to be necessary or appropriate to maintain the general level of reciprocal and mutually advantageous concessions with respect to a USMCA country provided for by the USMCA.

(3) **CONVERSION TO AD VALOREM RATES.**—For purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2), with respect to any good for which the base rate in the Schedule of the United States to Annex 2-B of the USMCA is a specific or compound rate of duty, the President shall substitute for the base rate an ad valorem rate that the President determines to be equivalent to the base rate.

(4) **TARIFF-RATE QUOTAS.**—In implementing the tariff-rate quotas set forth in the Schedule of the United States to Annex 2-B of the USMCA, the President shall take such actions as may be necessary to ensure that imports of agricultural goods do not disrupt the orderly marketing of agricultural goods in the United States.

(5) **PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY RELATING TO RULES OF ORIGIN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may proclaim, as part of the HTS—

(i) the provisions set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA;

(ii) the provisions set forth in paragraph 2 of article 3.A.6 of Annex 3-A of the USMCA;

(iii) the provisions set forth in paragraph 5 of Annex 3-B of the USMCA;

(iv) the provisions set forth in paragraphs 14(b), 14(c), and 15(e) of Section B of Appendix 2 to Annex 2-B of the USMCA; and

(v) any additional subordinate category that is necessary to carry out section 202 and section 202A consistent with the USMCA.

(B) **MODIFICATIONS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to the consultation and layover provisions of section 104, the President may proclaim modifications to the provisions proclaimed under the authority of subparagraph (A), other than the provisions of chapters 50 through 63 of the USMCA.

(ii) **SPECIAL RULE FOR TEXTILES.**—Notwithstanding clause (i), and subject to the consultation and layover provisions of section 104, the President may proclaim—

(I) such modifications to the provisions proclaimed under the authority of subparagraph (A) as are necessary to implement an agreement with one or more USMCA countries pursuant to article 6.4 of the USMCA; and

(II) before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date on which the USMCA enters into force, modifications to correct any typographical, clerical, or other nonsubstantive technical error regarding the provisions of chapters 50 through 63 of the USMCA.

SEC. 104. CONSULTATION AND LAYOVER PROVISIONS FOR, AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF, PROCLAIMED ACTIONS.

If a provision of this Act provides that the implementation of an action by the President by proclamation is subject to the consultation and layover requirements of this section, that action may be proclaimed only if—

(1) the President has obtained advice regarding the proposed action from—

(A) the appropriate advisory committees established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155); and

(B) the International Trade Commission, which shall hold a public hearing on the proposed action before providing advice regarding the proposed action;

(2) the President has submitted to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report that sets forth—

(A) the proposed action and the reasons therefor; and

(B) the advice obtained under paragraph (1);

(3) a period of 60 calendar days, beginning on the first day on which the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) have been met, has expired; and

(4) the President has consulted with the committees referred to in paragraph (2) regarding the proposed action during the period referred to in paragraph (3).

SEC. 105. ADMINISTRATION OF DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PROCEEDINGS.

(a) **UNITED STATES SECTION OF SECRETARIAT.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OR DESIGNATION OF OFFICE.**—The President is authorized to establish or designate within the Department of Commerce an office to serve as the United States Section of the Secretariat established under article 30.6 of the USMCA.

(2) **FUNCTIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.**—The office established or designated under paragraph (1), subject to the oversight of the interagency group established under section 411(c)(2), shall—

(A) carry out its functions within the Secretariat to facilitate the operation of the USMCA, including the operation of section D of chapter 10 and chapter 31 of the USMCA; and

(B) provide administrative assistance to—

(i) panels established under chapter 31 of the USMCA, including under Annex 31-A (relating to the Facility-Specific Rapid Response Labor Mechanism);

(ii) technical advisers and experts provided for under chapter 31 of the USMCA;

(iii) binational panels and extraordinary challenge committees established under section D of chapter 10 of the USMCA; and

(iv) binational panels and extraordinary challenge committees established under NAFTA for matters covered by article 34.1 of the USMCA (relating to transition from NAFTA).

(3) **TREATMENT OF OFFICE UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.**—The office established or designated under paragraph (1) shall not be considered an agency for purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2020 to the Department of Commerce \$2,000,000 for—

(1) the operations of the office established or designated under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) the payment of the United States share of the expenses of—

(A) panels established under chapter 31 of the USMCA, including under Annex 31-A (relating to the Facility-Specific Rapid Response Labor Mechanism);

(B) binational panels and extraordinary challenge committees established under section D of chapter 10 of the USMCA; and

(C) binational panels and extraordinary challenge committees established under NAFTA for matters covered by article 34.1 of the USMCA (relating to transition from NAFTA).

(c) **REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES.**—If the Canadian Section or the Mexican Section of the Secretariat provides funds to the United States Section during any fiscal year as reimbursement for expenses in connection with dispute settlement proceedings under section D of chapter 10 or chapter 31 of the USMCA, or under chapter 19 of NAFTA, the United States Section may, notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, retain and use such funds to carry out the functions described in subsection (a)(2).

SEC. 106. TRADE REPRESENTATIVE AUTHORITY.

If a country (other than the United States) that has signed the USMCA does not enact implementing legislation, the Trade Representative is authorized to enter into negotiations with the other country that has signed the USMCA to consider how the applicable provisions of the USMCA can come into force with respect to the United States and that other country as promptly as possible.

SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Sections 1 through 3 and this title (other than section 103(c)) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY.—Section 103(c) shall take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

TITLE II—CUSTOMS PROVISIONS**SEC. 201. EXCLUSION OF ORIGINATING GOODS OF USMCA COUNTRIES FROM SPECIAL AGRICULTURE SAFEGUARD AUTHORITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 405(e) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3602(e)) is amended to read as follows:

“(e) EXCLUSION OF ORIGINATING GOODS OF USMCA COUNTRIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall exempt from any duty imposed under this section any good that qualifies as an originating good under section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act of a USMCA country with respect to which preferential tariff treatment is provided under the USMCA.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘preferential tariff treatment’, ‘USMCA’, and ‘USMCA country’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—In the case of a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendment made by subsection (a) to section 405(e) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3602(e)) shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(B) section 405(e) of such Act, as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

SEC. 202. RULES OF ORIGIN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AQUACULTURE.—The term “aquaculture” means the farming of aquatic organisms, including fish, molluscs, crustaceans, other aquatic invertebrates, and aquatic plants from seed stock such as eggs, fry, fingerlings, or larvae, by intervention in the rearing or growth processes to enhance production such as regular stocking, feeding, or protection from predators.

(2) CUSTOMS VALUATION AGREEMENT.—The term “Customs Valuation Agreement” means the Agreement on Implementation of Article VII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 referred to in section 101(d)(8) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3511(d)(8)).

(3) FUNGIBLE GOOD OR FUNGIBLE MATERIAL.—The term “fungible good” or “fungible material” means a good or material, as the case may be, that is interchangeable with another good or material for commercial purposes and the properties of which are essentially identical to such other good or material.

(4) GOOD WHOLLY OBTAINED OR PRODUCED ENTIRELY IN THE TERRITORY OF ONE OR MORE USMCA COUNTRIES.—The term “good wholly obtained or produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries” means any of the following:

(A) A mineral good or other naturally occurring substance extracted or taken from

the territory of one or more USMCA countries.

(B) A plant, plant good, vegetable, or fungus grown, cultivated, harvested, picked, or gathered in the territory of one or more USMCA countries.

(C) A live animal born and raised in the territory of one or more USMCA countries.

(D) A good obtained in the territory of one or more USMCA countries from a live animal.

(E) An animal obtained by hunting, trapping, fishing, gathering, or capturing in the territory of one or more USMCA countries.

(F) A good obtained in the territory of one or more USMCA countries from aquaculture.

(G) A fish, shellfish, or other marine life taken from the sea, seabed, or subsoil outside the territory of one or more USMCA countries and outside the territorial sea of any country that is not a USMCA country by—

(i) a vessel that is registered or recorded with a USMCA country and flying the flag of that country; or

(ii) a vessel that is documented under the laws of the United States.

(H) A good produced on board a factory ship from goods referred to in subparagraph (G), if such factory ship—

(i) is registered or recorded with a USMCA country and flies the flag of that country; or

(ii) is a vessel that is documented under the laws of the United States.

(I) A good, other than a good referred to in subparagraph (G), that is taken by a USMCA country, or a person of a USMCA country, from the seabed or subsoil outside the territory of a USMCA country, if that USMCA country has the right to exploit such seabed or subsoil.

(J) Waste and scrap derived from—

(i) production in the territory of one or more USMCA countries; or

(ii) used goods collected in the territory of one or more USMCA countries, if such goods are fit only for the recovery of raw materials.

(K) A good produced in the territory of one or more USMCA countries exclusively from goods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (J), or from their derivatives, at any stage of production.

(5) INDIRECT MATERIAL.—The term “indirect material” means a material used or consumed in the production, testing, or inspection of a good but not physically incorporated into the good, or a material used or consumed in the maintenance of buildings or the operation of equipment associated with the production of a good, including—

(A) fuel and energy;

(B) tools, dies, and molds;

(C) spare parts and materials used or consumed in the maintenance of equipment or buildings;

(D) lubricants, greases, compounding materials, and other materials used or consumed in production or to operate equipment or buildings;

(E) gloves, glasses, footwear, clothing, safety equipment, and supplies;

(F) equipment, devices, and supplies used for testing or inspecting the good;

(G) catalysts and solvents; and

(H) any other material that is not incorporated into the good, if the use of the material in the production of the good can reasonably be demonstrated to be a part of that production.

(6) INTERMEDIATE MATERIAL.—The term “intermediate material” means a material that is self-produced, used or consumed in the production of a good, and designated as an intermediate material pursuant to subsection (d)(9).

(7) MATERIAL.—The term “material” means a good that is used or consumed in

the production of another good and includes a part or an ingredient.

(8) NET COST.—The term “net cost” means total cost minus sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service costs, royalties, shipping and packing costs, and non-allowable interest costs that are included in the total cost.

(9) NET COST OF A GOOD.—The term “net cost of a good” means the net cost that can be reasonably allocated to a good using one of the methods set forth in subsection (d)(7).

(10) NONALLOWABLE INTEREST COSTS.—The term “nonallowable interest costs” means interest costs incurred by a producer that exceed 700 basis points above the applicable official interest rate for comparable maturities of the country in which the producer is located.

(11) NONORIGINATING GOOD OR NONORIGINATING MATERIAL.—The term “nonoriginating good” or “nonoriginating material” means a good or material, as the case may be, that does not qualify as originating under this section.

(12) ORIGINATING GOOD; ORIGINATING MATERIAL.—The term “originating good” or “originating material” means a good or material, as the case may be, that qualifies as originating under this section.

(13) PACKAGING MATERIALS AND CONTAINERS.—The term “packaging materials and containers” means materials and containers in which a good is packaged for retail sale.

(14) PACKING MATERIALS AND CONTAINERS.—The term “packing materials and containers” means materials and containers that are used to protect a good during transportation.

(15) PRODUCER.—The term “producer” means a person who engages in the production of a good.

(16) PRODUCTION.—The term “production” means—

(A) growing, cultivating, raising, mining, harvesting, fishing, trapping, hunting, capturing, breeding, extracting, manufacturing, processing, or assembling a good; or

(B) the farming of aquatic organisms through aquaculture.

(17) REASONABLY ALLOCATE.—The term “reasonably allocate” means to apportion in a manner appropriate to the circumstances.

(18) RECOVERED MATERIAL.—The term “recovered material” means a material in the form of individual parts that are the result of—

(A) the disassembly of a used good into individual parts; and

(B) the cleaning, inspecting, testing, or other processing that is necessary for improvement to sound working condition of such individual parts.

(19) REMANUFACTURED GOOD.—The term “remanufactured good” means a good classified in the HTS under any of chapters 84 through 90 or under heading 9402, other than a good classified under heading 8418, 8509, 8510, 8516, or 8703 or subheading 8414.51, 8450.11, 8450.12, 8508.11, or 8517.11, that—

(A) is entirely or partially composed of recovered materials;

(B) has a life expectancy similar to, and performs in a manner that is the same as or similar to, such a good when new; and

(C) has a factory warranty similar to that applicable to such a good when new.

(20) ROYALTIES.—The term “royalties” means payments of any kind, including payments under technical assistance or similar agreements, made as consideration for the use of, or right to use, a copyright, literary, artistic, or scientific work, patent, trademark, design, model, plan, or secret formula or secret process, excluding payments under technical assistance or similar agreements

that can be related to a specific service such as—

(A) personnel training, without regard to where the training is performed; or

(B) if performed in the territory of one or more USMCA countries, engineering, tooling, die-setting, software design and similar computer services, or other services.

(21) SALES PROMOTION, MARKETING, AND AFTER-SALES SERVICE COSTS.—The term “sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service costs” means the costs related to sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service for the following:

(A) Sales and marketing promotion, media advertising, advertising and market research, promotional and demonstration materials, exhibits, sales conferences, trade shows, conventions, banners, marketing displays, free samples, sales, marketing, and after-sales service literature (product brochures, catalogs, technical literature, price lists, service manuals, and sales aid information), establishment and protection of logos and trademarks, sponsorships, wholesale and retail charges, and entertainment.

(B) Sales and marketing incentives, consumer, retailer, or wholesaler rebates, and merchandise incentives.

(C) Salaries and wages, sales commissions, bonuses, benefits (such as medical, insurance, and pension benefits), traveling and living expenses, and membership and professional fees for sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service personnel.

(D) Product liability insurance.

(E) Rent and depreciation of sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service offices and distribution centers.

(F) Payments by the producer to other persons for warranty repairs.

(G) If the costs are identified separately for sales promotion, marketing, or after-sales service of goods on the financial statements or cost accounts of the producer, the following:

(i) Property insurance premiums, taxes, utilities, and repair and maintenance of sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service offices and distribution centers.

(ii) Recruiting and training of sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service personnel, and after-sales training of customers' employees.

(iii) Office supplies for sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service of goods.

(iv) Telephone, mail, and other communications.

(22) SELF-PRODUCED MATERIAL.—The term “self-produced material” means a material that is produced by the producer of a good and used in the production of that good.

(23) SHIPPING AND PACKING COSTS.—The term “shipping and packing costs” means the costs incurred in packing a good for shipment and shipping the good from the point of direct shipment to the buyer, excluding the costs of preparing and packaging the good for retail sale.

(24) TERRITORY.—The term “territory”, with respect to a USMCA country, has the meaning given that term in section C of chapter 1 of the USMCA.

(25) TOTAL COST.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “total cost”—

(i) means all product costs, period costs, and other costs for a good incurred in the territory of one or more USMCA countries; and

(ii) does not include—

(I) profits that are earned by the producer of the good, regardless of whether the costs are retained by the producer or paid out to other persons as dividends; or

(II) taxes paid on those profits, including capital gains taxes.

(B) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) OTHER COSTS.—The term “other costs” means all costs recorded on the books of the producer that are not product costs or period costs, such as interest.

(ii) PERIOD COSTS.—The term “period costs” means costs, other than product costs, that are expensed in the period in which they are incurred, such as selling expenses and general and administrative expenses.

(iii) PRODUCT COSTS.—The term “product costs” means costs that are associated with the production of a good, including the value of materials, direct labor costs, and direct overhead.

(26) TRANSACTION VALUE.—The term “transaction value” means the price—

(A) actually paid or payable for a good or material with respect to a transaction of a producer; and

(B) adjusted in accordance with the principles set forth in paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 of article 8 of the Customs Valuation Agreement.

(27) USMCA COUNTRY.—The term “USMCA country” means the United States, Canada, or Mexico for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to Canada or Mexico, and the United States applies the USMCA to Canada or Mexico.

(28) VALUE.—The term “value” means the value of a good or material for purposes of calculating customs duties or applying this section.

(b) APPLICATION AND INTERPRETATION.—In this section:

(1) TARIFF CLASSIFICATION.—The basis for any tariff classification is the HTS.

(2) REFERENCE TO HTS.—Whenever in this section there is a reference to a chapter, heading, or subheading, that reference shall be a reference to a chapter, heading, or subheading of the HTS.

(3) COST OR VALUE.—Any cost or value referred to in this section with respect to a good shall be recorded and maintained in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles applicable in the territory of the USMCA country in which the good is produced.

(c) ORIGINATING GOODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this Act and for purposes of implementing the preferential tariff treatment provided for under the USMCA, except as otherwise provided in this section, a good is an originating good if—

(A) the good is a good wholly obtained or produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries;

(B) the good is produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries using nonoriginating materials, if the good satisfies all applicable requirements set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA; or

(C) the good is produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries, exclusively from originating materials;

(D) except for a good provided for under any of chapters 61 through 63—

(i) the good is produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries;

(ii) one or more of the nonoriginating materials provided for as parts under the HTS and used in the production of the good do not satisfy the requirements set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA because—

(I) both the good and its materials are classified under the same subheading or under the same heading that is not further subdivided into subheadings; or

(II) the good was imported into the territory of a USMCA country in an unassembled form or a disassembled form but was classified as an assembled good pursuant to rule 2(a) of the General Rules of Interpretation of the HTS; and

(iii) the regional value content of the good is not less than 60 percent if the transaction value method is used, or not less than 50 percent if the net cost method is used and the good satisfies all other applicable requirements of this section; or

(E) the good itself, as imported, is listed in table 2.10.1 of the USMCA and is imported into the territory of the United States from the territory of a USMCA country.

(2) REMANUFACTURED GOODS.—For purposes of determining whether a remanufactured good is an originating good, a recovered material derived in the territory of one or more USMCA countries shall be treated as originating if the recovered material is used or consumed in the production of, and incorporated into, the remanufactured good.

(d) REGIONAL VALUE CONTENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (5), for purposes of subparagraphs (B) and (D) of subsection (c)(1), the regional value content of a good shall be calculated, at the choice of the importer, exporter, or producer of the good, on the basis of—

(A) the transaction value method described in paragraph (2); or

(B) the net cost method described in paragraph (3).

(2) TRANSACTION VALUE METHOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An importer, exporter, or producer of a good may calculate the regional value content of the good on the basis of the following transaction value method:

$$RVC = \frac{TV - VNM}{TV} \times 100$$

(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) RVC.—The term “RVC” means the regional value content of the good, expressed as a percentage.

(ii) TV.—The term “TV” means the transaction value of the good, adjusted to exclude any costs incurred in the international shipment of the good.

(iii) VNM.—The term “VNM” means the value of nonoriginating materials used by the producer in the production of the good.

(3) NET COST METHOD.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An importer, exporter, or producer of a good may calculate the regional value content of the good on the basis of the following net cost method:

$$RVC = \frac{NC - VNM}{NC} \times 100$$

(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

(i) NC.—The term “NC” means the net cost of the good.

(ii) RVC.—The term “RVC” means the regional value content of the good, expressed as a percentage.

(iii) VNM.—The term “VNM” means the value of nonoriginating materials used by the producer in the production of the good.

(4) VALUE OF NONORIGINATING MATERIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The value of nonoriginating materials used by the producer in the production of a good shall not, for purposes of calculating the regional value content of the good under paragraph (2) or (3), include the value of nonoriginating materials used or consumed to produce originating materials that are subsequently used or consumed in the production of the good.

(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN COMPONENTS.—The following components of the value of nonoriginating materials used by the producer in the production of a good may be counted as originating content for purposes of determining whether the good meets the regional value content requirement set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA:

(i) The value of processing the nonoriginating materials undertaken in the territory of one or more USMCA countries.

(ii) The value of any originating materials used or consumed in the production of the nonoriginating materials undertaken in the territory of one or more USMCA countries.

(5) NET COST METHOD REQUIRED IN CERTAIN CASES.—An importer, exporter, or producer of a good shall calculate the regional value content of the good solely on the basis of the net cost method described in paragraph (3) if the rule for the good set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA includes a regional value content requirement not based on the transaction value method described in paragraph (2).

(6) NET COST METHOD ALLOWED FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an importer, exporter, or producer of a good calculates the regional value content of the good on the basis of the transaction value method described in paragraph (2) and a USMCA country subsequently notifies the importer, exporter, or producer, during the course of a verification conducted in accordance with chapter 5 or 6 of the USMCA, that the transaction value of the good or the value of any material used in the production of the good must be adjusted or is unacceptable under article 1 of the Customs Valuation Agreement, the importer, exporter, or producer may calculate the regional value content of the good on the basis of the net cost method.

(B) REVIEW OF ADJUSTMENT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prevent any review or appeal available in accordance with article 5.15 of the USMCA with respect to an adjustment to or a rejection of—

(i) the transaction value of a good; or

(ii) the value of any material used in the production of a good.

(7) CALCULATING NET COST.—The producer of a good may, consistent with regulations implementing this section, calculate the net cost of the good under paragraph (3) by—

(A) calculating the total cost incurred with respect to all goods produced by that producer, subtracting any sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales services costs, royalties, shipping and packing costs, and nonallowable interest costs that are included in the total cost of those goods, and then reasonably allocating the resulting net cost of those goods to the good;

(B) calculating the total cost incurred with respect to all goods produced by that producer, reasonably allocating the total cost to the good, and subtracting any sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service costs, royalties, shipping and packing costs, and nonallowable interest costs, that are included in the portion of the total cost allocated to the good; or

(C) reasonably allocating each cost that is part of the total cost incurred with respect to the good so that the aggregate of those costs does not include any sales promotion, marketing, and after-sales service costs, royalties, shipping and packing costs, and nonallowable interest costs.

(8) VALUE OF MATERIALS USED IN PRODUCTION.—For purposes of calculating the regional value content of a good under this subsection, applying the de minimis rules under subsection (f), and calculating the value of nonoriginating components in a set under subsection (m), the value of a material used in the production of a good is—

(A) in the case of a material that is imported by the producer of the good, the transaction value of the material at the time of importation, including the costs incurred in the international shipment of the material;

(B) in the case of a material acquired in the territory in which the good is produced—

(i) the price paid or payable by the producer in the USMCA country where the producer is located;

(ii) the value as determined under subparagraph (A), as set forth in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury providing for the application of transaction value in the absence of an importation by the producer; or

(iii) the earliest ascertainable price paid or payable in the territory of the country; or

(C) in the case of a self-produced material, the sum of—

(i) all expenses incurred in the production of the material, including general expenses; and

(ii) an amount for profit equivalent to the profit added in the normal course of trade or equal to the profit that is usually reflected in the sale of goods of the same class or kind as the material.

(9) INTERMEDIATE MATERIALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any self-produced material that is used in the production of a good may be designated by the producer of the good as an intermediate material for purposes of calculating the regional value content of the good under paragraph (2) or (3).

(B) MATERIALS USED IN PRODUCTION OF INTERMEDIATE MATERIALS.—If a self-produced material is designated as an intermediate material under subparagraph (A) for purposes of calculating a regional value content requirement, no other self-produced material subject to a regional value content requirement used or consumed in the production of that intermediate material may be designated by the producer as an intermediate material.

(10) FURTHER ADJUSTMENTS TO VALUE OF MATERIALS.—The following expenses, if included in the value of a nonoriginating material calculated under paragraph (8), may be deducted from the value of the nonoriginating material:

(A) The costs of freight, insurance, packing, and all other costs incurred in transporting the material to the location of the producer.

(B) Duties, taxes, and customs brokerage fees on the material paid in the territory of one or more USMCA countries, other than duties or taxes that are waived, refunded, refundable, or otherwise recoverable, including credit against duty or tax paid or payable.

(C) The cost of waste and spoilage resulting from the use of the material in the production of the good, less the value of renewable scrap or byproducts.

(e) ACCUMULATION.—

(1) PRODUCERS.—A good that is produced in the territory of one or more USMCA countries, by one or more producers, is an originating good if the good satisfies the requirements of subsection (c) and all other applicable requirements of this section.

(2) ORIGINATING MATERIALS USED IN PRODUCTION OF GOODS OF A USMCA COUNTRY.—Originating materials from the territory of one or more USMCA countries that are used in the production of a good in the territory of another USMCA country shall be considered to originate in the territory of such other USMCA country.

(3) PRODUCTION UNDERTAKEN ON NONORIGINATING MATERIALS USED IN THE PRODUCTION OF GOODS.—In determining whether a good is an originating good under this section, production undertaken on nonoriginating material in the territory of one or more USMCA countries by one or more producers shall contribute to the originating status of the good, regardless of whether that production is sufficient to confer originating status to the nonoriginating material.

(f) DE MINIMIS AMOUNTS OF NONORIGINATING MATERIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) through (4), a good that does not undergo a change in tariff classification or satisfy a regional value content requirement set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA is an originating good if—

(A) the value of all nonoriginating materials that are used in the production of the good, and do not undergo the applicable change in tariff classification set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA—

(i) does not exceed 10 percent of the transaction value of the good, adjusted to exclude any costs incurred in the international shipment of the good; or

(ii) does not exceed 10 percent of the total cost of the good;

(B) the good meets all other applicable requirements of this section; and

(C) the value of such nonoriginating materials is included in the value of nonoriginating materials for any applicable regional value content requirement for the good.

(2) EXCEPTIONS FOR DAIRY AND OTHER PRODUCTS.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to the following:

(A) A nonoriginating material of headings 0401 through 0406, or a nonoriginating dairy preparation containing over 10 percent by dry weight of milk solids of subheading 1901.90 or 2106.90, used or consumed in the production of a good of headings 0401 through 0406.

(B) A nonoriginating material of headings 0401 through 0406, or nonoriginating dairy preparation containing over 10 percent by dry weight of milk solids of subheading 1901.90 or 2106.90, used or consumed in the production of any of the following goods:

(i) Infant preparations containing over 10 percent by dry weight of milk solids, of subheading 1901.10.

(ii) Mixes and doughs containing over 25 percent by dry weight of butterfat, not put up for retail sale, of subheading 1901.20.

(iii) A dairy preparation containing over 10 percent by dry weight of milk solids, of subheading 1901.90 or 2106.90.

(iv) A good of heading 2105.

(v) Beverages containing milk of subheading 2202.90.

(vi) Animal feeds containing over 10 percent by dry weight of milk solids of subheading 2309.90.

(C) A nonoriginating material of heading 0805, or any of subheadings 2009.11 through 2009.39, used or consumed in the production of a good of subheadings 2009.11 through 2009.39, or a fruit or vegetable juice of any single fruit or vegetable, fortified with minerals or vitamins, concentrated or unconcentrated, of subheading 2106.90 or 2202.90.

(D) A nonoriginating material of chapter 9 used or consumed in the production of instant coffee, not flavored, of subheading 2101.11.

(E) A nonoriginating material of chapter 15 used or consumed in the production of a good of heading 1507, 1508, 1512, 1514, or 1515.

(F) A nonoriginating material of heading 1701 used or consumed in the production of a good of any of headings 1701 through 1703.

(G) A nonoriginating material of chapter 17 or heading 1805 used in the production of a good of subheading 1806.10.

(H) Nonoriginating peaches, pears, or apricots of chapter 8 or 20, used in the production of a good of heading 2008.

(I) A nonoriginating single juice ingredient of heading 2009 used or consumed in the production of a good of—

(i) subheading 2009.90, or tariff item 2106.90.54 (concentrated mixtures of fruit or vegetable juice, fortified with minerals or vitamins); or

(ii) tariff item 2202.99.37 (mixtures of fruit or vegetable juices, fortified with minerals or vitamins).

(J) A nonoriginating material of any of headings 2203 through 2208 used or consumed in the production of a good provided for under heading 2207 or 2208.

(3) GOODS PROVIDED FOR UNDER CHAPTERS 1 THROUGH 27.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to a nonoriginating material used or consumed in the production of a good provided for in chapters 1 through 27 unless the nonoriginating material is provided for in a different subheading than the subheading of the good for which origin is being determined.

(4) TEXTILE OR APPAREL GOODS.—

(A) GOODS CLASSIFIED UNDER CHAPTERS 50 THROUGH 60.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a textile or apparel good provided for in any of chapters 50 through 60 or heading 9619 that is not an originating good because certain nonoriginating materials used in the production of the good do not undergo an applicable change in tariff classification set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA, shall be considered to be an originating good if the total weight of all such materials, including elastomeric yarns, is not more than 10 percent of the total weight of the good and the good meets all other applicable requirements of this section.

(B) GOODS CLASSIFIED UNDER CHAPTERS 61 THROUGH 63.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), a textile or apparel good provided for in chapter 61, 62, or 63 that is not an originating good because certain fibers or yarns used in the production of the component of the good that determines the tariff classification of the good do not undergo an applicable change in tariff classification set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA shall be considered to be an originating good if the total weight of all such fibers or yarns in the component, including elastomeric yarns, is not more than 10 percent of the total weight of the component and the good meets all other applicable requirements of this section.

(C) GOODS CONTAINING NONORIGINATING ELASTOMERIC YARNS.—

(i) GOODS CLASSIFIED UNDER CHAPTERS 50 THROUGH 60 OR HEADING 9619.—A textile or apparel good described in subparagraph (A) containing nonoriginating elastomeric yarns shall be considered to be an originating good only if the nonoriginating elastomeric yarns contained in the good do not exceed 7 percent of the total weight of the good.

(ii) GOODS CLASSIFIED UNDER CHAPTERS 61 THROUGH 63.—A textile or apparel good described in subparagraph (B) containing nonoriginating elastomeric yarns shall be considered to be an originating good only if the nonoriginating elastomeric yarns contained in the component of the good that determines the tariff classification of the good do not exceed 7 percent of the total weight of the good.

(g) FUNGIBLE GOODS AND MATERIALS.—

(1) FUNGIBLE MATERIALS USED IN PRODUCTION.—Subject to paragraph (3), if originating and nonoriginating fungible materials are used or consumed in the production of a good, the determination of whether the materials are originating may be made on the basis of any of the inventory management methods set forth in regulations implementing this section.

(2) FUNGIBLE GOODS COMMINGLED AND EXPORTED.—Subject to paragraph (3), if originating and nonoriginating fungible goods are commingled and exported in the same form, the determination of whether the goods are originating may be made on the basis of any of the inventory management methods set forth in regulations implementing this section.

(3) USE OF INVENTORY MANAGEMENT METHOD.—A person that selects an inventory man-

agement method for purposes of paragraph (1) or (2) shall use that inventory management method throughout the fiscal year of the person.

(h) ACCESSORIES, SPARE PARTS, TOOLS, AND INSTRUCTIONAL OR OTHER INFORMATION MATERIALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), accessories, spare parts, tools, or instructional or other information materials delivered with a good shall—

(A) be treated as originating if the good is an originating good;

(B) be disregarded in determining whether a good is a good wholly obtained or produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries or satisfies a process or change in tariff classification set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA; and

(C) be taken into account as originating or nonoriginating materials, as the case may be, in calculating any applicable regional value content of the good set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA.

(2) CONDITIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only if—

(A) the accessories, spare parts, tools, or instructional or other information materials are classified with and delivered with, but not invoiced separately from, the good; and

(B) the types, quantities, and value of the accessories, spare parts, tools, or instructional or other information materials are customary for the good.

(i) PACKAGING MATERIALS AND CONTAINERS FOR RETAIL SALE.—Packaging materials and containers in which a good is packaged for retail sale, if classified with the good, shall be disregarded in determining whether all of the nonoriginating materials used in the production of the good undergo the applicable process or change in tariff classification requirement set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA, or whether the good is a good wholly obtained or produced entirely in the territory of one or more USMCA countries. If the good is subject to a regional value content requirement set forth in that Annex, the value of such packaging materials and containers shall be taken into account as originating or nonoriginating materials, as the case may be, in calculating the regional value content of the good.

(j) PACKING MATERIALS AND CONTAINERS FOR SHIPMENT.—Packing materials and containers for shipment shall be disregarded in determining whether a good is an originating good.

(k) INDIRECT MATERIALS.—An indirect material shall be treated as an originating material without regard to where it is produced.

(l) TRANSIT AND TRANSHIPMENT.—A good that has undergone production necessary to qualify as an originating good under subsection (c) shall not be considered to be an originating good if, subsequent to that production, the good—

(1) undergoes further production or any other operation outside the territory of a USMCA country, other than—

(A) unloading, reloading, separation from a bulk shipment, storing, labeling, or marking, as required by a USMCA country; or

(B) any other operation necessary to preserve the good in good condition or to transport the good to the territory of the importing USMCA country; or

(2) does not remain under the control of customs authorities in a country other than a USMCA country.

(m) GOODS CLASSIFIABLE AS GOODS PUT UP IN SETS.—

(1) GOODS OTHER THAN TEXTILE OR APPAREL GOODS.—Notwithstanding the rules set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA, goods classifiable as goods put up in sets for retail sale as provided for in rule 3 of the General Rule of Interpretation of the HTS shall not be considered to be originating goods unless—

(A) each of the goods in the set is an originating good; or

(B) the total value of the nonoriginating goods in the set does not exceed 10 percent of the value of the set.

(2) TEXTILE OR APPAREL GOODS.—Notwithstanding the rules set forth in Annex 4-B of the USMCA, goods classifiable as goods put up in sets for retail sale as provided for in rule 3 of the General Rule of Interpretation of the HTS shall not be considered to be originating goods unless—

(A) each of the goods in the set is an originating good; or

(B) the total value of the nonoriginating goods in the set does not exceed 10 percent of the value of the set.

(n) NONQUALIFYING OPERATIONS.—A good shall not be considered to be an originating good merely by reason of—

(1) mere dilution with water or another substance that does not materially alter the characteristics of the good; or

(2) any production or pricing practice with respect to which it may be demonstrated, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the object of the practice was to circumvent this section.

(o) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—Section 202 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3332), as in effect on the day before the date on which the USMCA enters into force, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, before that date.

SEC. 202A. SPECIAL RULES FOR AUTOMOTIVE GOODS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME.—The term “alternative staging regime” means the application, pursuant to subsection (d), of the requirements of article 8 of the automotive appendix to the production of covered vehicles to allow producers of such vehicles to bring such production into compliance with the requirements of articles 2 through 7 of that appendix.

(2) ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME PERIOD.—The term “alternative staging regime period” means the period during which the alternative staging regime is in effect.

(3) AUTOMOTIVE APPENDIX.—The term “automotive appendix” means the Appendix to Annex 4-B of the USMCA (relating to the product-specific rules of origin for automotive goods).

(4) AUTOMOTIVE GOOD.—The term “automotive good” means—

(A) a covered vehicle; or

(B) a part, component, or material listed in table A.1, A.2, B, C, D, or E of the automotive appendix.

(5) AUTOMOTIVE RULES OF ORIGIN.—The term “automotive rules of origin” means the rules of origin for automotive goods set forth in the automotive appendix.

(6) COMMISSIONER.—The term “Commissioner” means the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(7) COVERED VEHICLE.—The term “covered vehicle” means a passenger vehicle, light truck, or heavy truck.

(8) INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.—The term “interagency committee” means the interagency committee established under subsection (b)(1).

(9) PASSENGER VEHICLE; LIGHT TRUCK; HEAVY TRUCK.—The terms “passenger vehicle”, “light truck”, and “heavy truck” have

the meanings given those terms in article 1 of the automotive appendix.

(10) **USMCA COUNTRY.**—The term “USMCA country” means the United States, Canada, or Mexico for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to Canada or Mexico, and the United States applies the USMCA to Canada or Mexico.

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish an interagency committee—

(A) to provide advice, as appropriate, on the implementation, enforcement, and modification of provisions of the USMCA that relate to automotive goods, including the alternative staging regime; and

(B) to review the operation of the USMCA with respect to trade in automotive goods, including—

(i) the economic effects of the automotive rules of origin on the United States economy, workers, and consumers; and

(ii) the impact of new technology on such rules of origin.

(2) **MEMBERS.**—The members of the interagency committee shall be the following:

(A) The Trade Representative.

(B) The Secretary of Commerce.

(C) The Commissioner.

(D) The Secretary of Labor.

(E) The Chair of the International Trade Commission.

(F) Any other members determined to be necessary by the Trade Representative.

(3) **CHAIR.**—The chair of the interagency committee shall be the Trade Representative.

(4) **USE OF INFORMATION.**—

(A) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the members of the interagency committee may exchange information for purposes of carrying out this section.

(B) **CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.**—The interagency committee and any Federal agency represented on the interagency committee may not disclose to the public any confidential documents or information received in the course of carrying out this section, except information aggregated to preserve confidentiality and used in the reports described in subsection (g).

(c) **CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **CERTIFICATION RELATING TO LABOR VALUE CONTENT REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A covered vehicle shall be eligible for preferential tariff treatment only if the producer of the covered vehicle—

(i) provides a certification to the Commissioner that the production of covered vehicles by the producer meets the labor value content requirements, including the high-wage material and manufacturing expenditures, high-wage technology expenditures, and high-wage assembly expenditures, as set forth in article 7 of the automotive appendix or, if the producer is subject to the alternative staging regime, articles 7 and 8 of that appendix, and includes the calculations of the producer related to the labor value content requirements; and

(ii) has information on record to support those calculations.

(B) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—For purposes of meeting the requirements under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Commissioner, shall ensure that the certification of a producer under subparagraph (A)(i) does not contain omissions or errors before the certification is considered properly filed; and

(ii) a calculation described in subparagraph (A)(i) based on a producer's preceding fiscal or calendar year is valid for the producer's

subsequent fiscal or calendar year, as the case may be, as set forth in articles 7 and 8 of the automotive appendix.

(C) **REGULATIONS REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, including regulations setting forth the procedures and requirements for a producer of covered vehicles to establish that the producer meets the labor value content requirements for preferential tariff treatment.

(2) **CERTIFICATION RELATING TO STEEL AND ALUMINUM PURCHASE REQUIREMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A covered vehicle shall be eligible for preferential tariff treatment only if the producer of the covered vehicle—

(i) provides a certification to the Commissioner that the production of covered vehicles by the producer meets the steel and aluminum purchase requirements set forth in article 6 of the automotive appendix or, if the producer is subject to the alternative staging regime, articles 6 and 8 of that appendix; and

(ii) has information on record to support the calculations relied on for the certification.

(B) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—For purposes of meeting the requirements under subparagraph (A)—

(i) the Commissioner shall ensure that the certification of a producer under subparagraph (A)(i) does not contain omissions or errors before the certification is considered properly filed; and

(ii) a calculation described in subparagraph (A)(ii) based on a producer's preceding fiscal or calendar year is valid for the producer's subsequent fiscal or calendar year, as the case may be, as set forth in articles 6 and 8 of the automotive appendix.

(C) **REGULATIONS REQUIRED.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, including regulations setting forth the procedures and requirements for a producer of covered vehicles to establish that the producer meets the steel and aluminum purchase requirements for preferential tariff treatment.

(d) **ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME.**—

(1) **PUBLICATION OF REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, shall publish in the Federal Register requirements, procedures, and guidance required to implement the alternative staging regime, including with respect to the following:

(A) The procedures, calculation methodology, timeframe, specific regional value content thresholds, and other minimum requirements, consistent with article 8 of the automotive appendix, with which a producer of covered vehicles subject to the alternative staging regime is required to comply during the alternative staging regime period for such vehicles to be eligible for preferential tariff treatment pursuant to the alternative staging regime.

(B) The date by which requests for the alternative staging regime are required to be submitted.

(C) The information a producer of passenger vehicles or light trucks is required to provide, in the producer's request to use the alternative staging regime, to demonstrate the actions that the producer will take to be prepared to meet all the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired, including the following:

(i) A statement identifying which of the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix that the producer expects it will be unable to meet upon

entry into force of the USMCA based on current business plans.

(ii) A statement indicating whether the passenger vehicles or light trucks for which the producer seeks to use the alternative staging regime account for 10 percent or less, or more than 10 percent, of the total production of passenger vehicles or light trucks, as the case may be, in USMCA countries by the producer during the 12-month period preceding the date on which the USMCA enters into force, or the average of such production during the 36-month period preceding that date, whichever is greater.

(iii) In the case of a producer that seeks to use the alternative staging regime for more than 10 percent of the producer's total production of passenger vehicles or light trucks, as the case may be, in USMCA countries—

(I) a detailed and credible plan describing with specificity the actions the producer intends to take to bring production of the passenger vehicles or light trucks, as the case may be, into compliance with the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period expires; and

(II) a statement indicating the time period for which the producer is requesting to use the alternative staging regime, if that time period is greater than 5 years after the USMCA enters into force.

(D) The procedures for accepting and reviewing requests for the alternative staging regime, including that the Trade Representative will—

(i) notify a producer of any deficiencies in the request of the producer that would result in a denial of the request not later than 30 days after the request is submitted; and

(ii) provide producers the opportunity to submit supplemental information.

(E) The criteria the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, will consider when determining whether to approve a request for the alternative staging regime. Such criteria shall only include elements necessary for the producer to demonstrate the producer's ability to meet the requirements specified in subparagraphs (A) and (B). The criteria shall also describe the information to meet those requirements in sufficient detail to allow the producer to identify the information necessary to complete a request for the alternative staging regime.

(F) The opportunity for a producer described in subparagraph (C)(iii) to modify the producer's request for the alternative staging regime.

(2) **REVIEW OF REQUESTS FOR ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In reviewing the request of a producer of passenger vehicles or light trucks for the alternative staging regime, the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, shall determine—

(i) whether the request covers 10 percent or less, or more than 10 percent, of the production of passenger vehicles or light trucks in USMCA countries by the producer; and

(ii) whether the producer has identified with specificity which of the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix the producer is unable to meet based on current business plans.

(B) **APPROVAL OF ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME FOR PASSENGER VEHICLE OR LIGHT TRUCK PRODUCTION NOT EXCEEDING 10 PERCENT OF NORTH AMERICAN PRODUCTION.**—The Trade Representative shall authorize the use of the alternative staging regime if the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, determines that—

(i) the request for the alternative staging regime covers passenger vehicles or light trucks that do not exceed 10 percent of the

production of passenger vehicles or lights trucks, as the case may be, in USMCA countries by the producer; and

(ii) the producer has identified with specificity which of the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix the producer is unable to meet based on current business plans.

(C) APPROVAL OF ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME FOR PASSENGER VEHICLE OR LIGHT TRUCK PRODUCTION EXCEEDING 10 PERCENT OF NORTH AMERICAN PRODUCTION.—The Trade Representative shall authorize the use of the alternative staging regime if the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, determines that—

(i) the request for the alternative staging regime covers more than 10 percent of the production of passenger vehicles or lights trucks, as the case may be, in USMCA countries by the producer;

(ii) the producer has identified with specificity which of the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix the producer is unable to meet based on current business plans; and

(iii) the detailed and credible plan of the producer submitted under paragraph (1)(C)(iii) is based on substantial evidence and reasonably calculated to bring the production of the passenger vehicles or light trucks, as the case may be, into compliance with the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired.

(3) PROCEDURES RELATED TO REVIEWING AND APPROVING REQUESTS.—

(A) DEADLINE FOR REVIEW.—Not later than 120 days after receiving a request of a producer for the alternative staging regime, the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, shall—

(i) review the request;

(ii) make a determination with respect to whether to authorize the use of the alternative staging regime; and

(iii) provide to each producer a response in writing stating whether the producer may use the alternative staging regime.

(B) ESTABLISHMENT OF A PUBLIC LIST.—The Trade Representative shall maintain, and update as necessary, a public list of the producers of covered vehicles that have been authorized to use the alternative staging regime.

(C) REPORTING.—Before a determination is made with respect to whether to authorize the use of the alternative staging regime, the Trade Representative shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees a summary of requests for the alternative staging regime.

(4) ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME REVIEW AND MODIFICATION.—

(A) MATERIAL CHANGES TO CIRCUMSTANCES.—

(i) NOTIFICATION.—If the request of a producer to use the alternative staging regime for more than 10 percent of the total production of passenger vehicles or light trucks, as the case may be, in USMCA countries by the producer has been granted, the producer shall notify the Trade Representative and the interagency committee of any material changes to the information contained in the request, including any supplemental information relating to that request, and of any material changes to circumstances, that will affect the producer's ability to meet any of the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired.

(ii) REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION OF PLANS.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—A producer that submits a notification under clause (i) with respect to

a change described in that clause may submit to the Trade Representative and the interagency committee a request for modification of its plan.

(II) DETERMINATION REGARDING MODIFICATION.—Not later than 90 days after receiving a request submitted under subclause (I), the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, shall—

(aa) review the request;

(bb) make a determination with respect to whether the modified plan is based on substantial evidence and reasonably calculated to ensure that the producer will still be able to meet the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired;

(cc) if the Trade Representative makes an affirmative determination under item (bb), approve the modified plan; and

(dd) notify the producer in writing of the determination.

(iii) INABILITY TO MEET REQUIREMENTS.—If the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, determines that the information provided by a producer under clause (i) demonstrates that the producer will no longer be able to meet the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired, the Trade Representative shall notify the producer in writing, and no claim for preferential tariff treatment may be made, on or after the date of the determination, with respect to a covered vehicle of the producer pursuant to the alternative staging regime.

(5) FAILURE TO MEET REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTERNATIVE STAGING REGIME.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, at any time, the Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, makes a determination described in subparagraph (B) with respect to a producer of covered vehicles subject to the alternative staging regime—

(i) any claim for preferential tariff treatment under the alternative staging regime for any covered vehicle of that producer shall be considered invalid; and

(ii) notwithstanding the finality of a liquidation of an entry, the importer of any covered vehicle of that producer shall be liable for the duties, taxes, and fees that would have been applicable to that vehicle if preferential tariff treatment pursuant to the alternative staging regime had not applied when the vehicle was entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, plus interest assessed on or after the date of entry and before the date of the determination.

(B) DETERMINATION DESCRIBED.—A determination described in this subparagraph is a determination that a producer of covered vehicles subject to the alternative staging regime—

(i) has failed to take the steps set forth in the producer's request for the alternative staging regime and, as a result of that failure, the producer will no longer be able to meet the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the automotive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired;

(ii) has provided false or misleading information in the producer's request; or

(iii) in the case of a producer authorized to use the alternative staging regime for more than 10 percent of the total production of passenger vehicles or light trucks in USMCA countries by the producer, has failed to notify the Trade Representative under paragraph (4)(A) of material changes to circumstances that will prevent the producer from meeting any of the requirements set forth in articles 2 through 7 of the auto-

motive appendix after the alternative staging regime period has expired.

(e) VERIFICATION OF LABOR VALUE CONTENT REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As part of a verification conducted under section 207, the Secretary of the Treasury, in conjunction with the Secretary of Labor, may conduct a verification of whether a covered vehicle complies with the labor value content requirements set forth in article 7 of the automotive appendix or, if the producer is subject to the alternative staging regime under subsection (d), articles 7 and 8 of that appendix.

(2) ROLE OF SECRETARY OF LABOR.—In cooperation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor shall participate in any verification conducted under paragraph (1) by verifying whether the production of covered vehicles by a producer meets the high-wage components of the labor value content requirements, including the wage component of the high-wage material and manufacturing expenditures, the high-wage technology expenditures, and the high-wage assembly expenditures, within the meaning given those terms in article 7 of that appendix.

(3) ROLE OF SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall participate in any verification conducted under paragraph (1) by verifying—

(A) the components of the labor value content requirements not covered by paragraph (2), including the annual purchase value and cost components of the high-wage material and manufacturing expenditures, within the meaning given those terms in article 7 of that appendix; and

(B) whether the producer has met the labor value content requirements.

(4) ACTIONS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In participating in a verification conducted under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall assist the Secretary of the Treasury to do the following:

(i) Examine, or cause to be examined, upon reasonable notice, any record (including any statement, declaration, document, or electronically generated or machine readable data) described in the notice with reasonable specificity.

(ii) Request information from any officer, employee, or agent of a producer of automotive goods, as necessary, that may be relevant with respect to whether the production of covered vehicles meets the high-wage components of the labor value content requirements set forth in article 7 of the automotive appendix or, if the producer is subject to the alternative staging regime under subsection (d), articles 7 and 8 of that appendix.

(B) NATURE OF INFORMATION REQUESTED.—Records and information that may be examined or requested under subparagraph (A) may relate to wages, hours, job responsibilities, and other information in any plant or facility relied on by a producer of covered vehicles to demonstrate that the production of such vehicles by the producer meets the labor value content requirements set forth in article 7 of the automotive appendix or, if the producer is subject to the alternative staging regime under subsection (d), articles 7 and 8 of that appendix.

(5) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS.—

(A) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—It is unlawful to intimidate, threaten, restrain, coerce, blacklist, discharge, or in any other manner discriminate against any person for—

(i) disclosing information to a Federal agency or to any person relating to a verification under this subsection; or

(ii) cooperating or seeking to cooperate in a verification under this subsection.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor are authorized to take such actions under existing

law, including imposing appropriate penalties and seeking appropriate injunctive relief, as may be necessary to ensure compliance with this subsection and as provided for in existing regulations.

(6) **PROTESTS OF DECISIONS OF U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If a protest under section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) of a decision of U.S. Customs and Border Protection with respect to the eligibility for preferential tariff treatment of a covered vehicle relates to the analysis of the Department of Labor relating to the high-wage components of the labor value content requirements described in paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall—

(i) conduct an administrative review of the portion of the decision relating to such requirements; and

(ii) provide the results of that review to the Commissioner.

(B) **NO ACCELERATED DISPOSITION.**—An importer may not request the accelerated disposition under section 515(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1515(b)) of a protest against a decision of the Commissioner described in subparagraph (A).

(f) **ADMINISTRATION BY DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.**—The Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish or designate an office within the Department of Labor to carry out the provisions of this section for which the Department is responsible.

(g) **REVIEW AND REPORTS.**—

(1) **PERIODIC REVIEW ON AUTOMOTIVE RULES OF ORIGIN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Trade Representative, in consultation with the interagency committee, shall conduct a biennial review of the operation of the USMCA with respect to trade in automotive goods, including—

(i) to the extent practicable, a summary of actions taken by producers to demonstrate compliance with the automotive rules of origin, use of the alternative staging regime, enforcement of such rules of origin, and other relevant matters; and

(ii) whether the automotive rules of origin are effective and relevant in light of new technology and changes in the content, production processes, and character of automotive goods.

(B) **REPORT.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Trade Representative shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on each review conducted under subparagraph (A).

(ii) **INITIAL REPORT.**—The first report required under clause (i) shall be submitted not later than 2 years after the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(iii) **TERMINATION OF REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—The requirement to submit reports under clause (i) shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(2) **REPORT BY INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—Not later than one year after the submission of the first report required by paragraph (1)(B), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 12 years after the date on which the USMCA enters into force, the International Trade Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and the President a report on—

(A) the economic impact of the automotive rules of origin on—

(i) the gross domestic product of the United States;

(ii) exports from and imports into the United States;

(iii) aggregate employment and employment opportunities in the United States;

(iv) production, investment, use of productive facilities, and profit levels in the automotive industries and other pertinent indus-

tries in the United States affected by the automotive rules of origin;

(v) wages and employment of workers in the automotive sector in the United States; and

(vi) the interests of consumers in the United States;

(B) the operation of the automotive rules of origin and their effects on the competitiveness of the United States with respect to production and trade in automotive goods, taking into account developments in technology, production processes, or other related matters;

(C) whether the automotive rules of origin are relevant in light of technological changes in the United States; and

(D) such other matters as the International Trade Commission considers relevant to the economic impact of the automotive rules of origin, including prices, sales, inventories, patterns of demand, capital investment, obsolescence of equipment, and diversification of production in the United States.

(3) **REPORT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.**—Not later than 4 years after the date on which the USMCA enters into force, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate a report assessing the effectiveness of United States Government interagency coordination on implementation, enforcement, and verification of the automotive rules of origin and the customs procedures of the USMCA with respect to automotive goods.

(4) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—Before submitting a report under paragraph (1)(B) or (2), the agency responsible for the report shall—

(A) solicit information relating to matters that will be addressed in the report from producers of automotive goods, labor organizations, and other interested parties;

(B) provide for an opportunity for the submission of comments, orally or in writing, from members of the public relating to such matters; and

(C) after submitting the report, post a version of the report appropriate for public viewing on a publicly available internet website for the agency.

(h) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This section shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply with respect to goods entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

SEC. 203. MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(b)(10) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(b)(10)) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) No fee may be charged under paragraph (9) or (10) of subsection (a) with respect to goods that qualify as originating goods under section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act or qualify for duty-free treatment under Annex 6-A of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of that Act). Any service for which an exemption from such fee is provided by reason of this paragraph may not be funded with money contained in the Customs User Fee Account.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered or released on or after that date.

(2) **TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.**—In the case of a good entered or released before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendments made by subsection (a) to section 13031(b)(10)(B) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(b)(10)(B)) shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(B) section 13031(b)(10)(B) of such Act, as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

(3) **ENTERED OR RELEASED DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term “entered or released” has the meaning given that term in section 13031(b)(8)(E) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(b)(8)(E)).

SEC. 204. DISCLOSURE OF INCORRECT INFORMATION; FALSE CERTIFICATIONS OF ORIGIN; DENIAL OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.

(a) **DISCLOSURE OF INCORRECT INFORMATION.**—Section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) **PRIOR DISCLOSURE REGARDING CLAIMS UNDER THE USMCA.**—An importer shall not be subject to penalties under subsection (a) for making an incorrect claim that a good qualifies as an originating good under section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act if the importer, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, promptly makes a corrected declaration and pays any duties owing with respect to that good.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

“(f) **FALSE CERTIFICATIONS OF ORIGIN UNDER THE USMCA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), it is unlawful for any person to certify falsely, by fraud, gross negligence, or negligence, in a USMCA certification of origin (as such term is defined in section 508 of this Act) that a good exported from the United States qualifies as an originating good under the rules of origin provided for in section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act. The procedures and penalties of this section that apply to a violation of subsection (a) also apply to a violation of this subsection.

“(2) **PROMPT AND VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE OF INCORRECT INFORMATION.**—No penalty shall be imposed under this subsection if, promptly after an exporter or producer that issued a USMCA certification of origin has reason to believe that such certification contains or is based on incorrect information, the exporter or producer voluntarily provides written notice of such incorrect information to every person to whom the certification was issued.

“(3) **EXCEPTION.**—A person shall not be considered to have violated paragraph (1) if—

“(A) the information was correct at the time it was provided in a USMCA certification of origin but was later rendered incorrect due to a change in circumstances; and

“(B) the person promptly and voluntarily provides written notice of the change in circumstances to all persons to whom the person provided the certification.”.

(b) **DENIAL OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.**—Section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “and article 1904” and all that follows through “Free-Trade Agreement”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter following subparagraph (D), by striking “section 202 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act” and inserting “section 202 of the United States-Mexico-

Canada Agreement Implementation Act"; and

(B) in paragraph (2)(E)—

(i) by striking "section 202 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act" and inserting "section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act"; and

(ii) by striking "NAFTA Certificate of Origin" and inserting "USMCA certification of origin (as such term is defined in section 508 of this Act)";

(3) in subsection (e), by striking "section 202 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act" and inserting "section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act"; and

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

"(f) DENIAL OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT UNDER THE USMCA.—If U.S. Customs and Border Protection or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement of the Department of Homeland Security finds indications of a pattern of conduct by an importer, exporter, or producer of false or unsupported representations that goods qualify under the rules of origin provided for in section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, may suspend preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of that Act) to entries of identical goods covered by subsequent representations by that importer, exporter, or producer until U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines that representations of that person are in conformity with such section 202."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered, or exported from the United States, as the case may be, on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—In the case of a good entered, or exported from the United States, as the case may be, before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendments made by subsection (a) to section 592 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1592) and the amendments made by subsection (b) to section 514 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1514) shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(B) sections 592 and 514 of such Act, as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

(3) ENTERED DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "entered" includes a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 205. RELIQUIDATION OF ENTRIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 520(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1520(d)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "section 202 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act";

(B) by striking "or section 203" and inserting "section 203"; and

(C) by striking "for which" and inserting "or section 202 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act (except with respect to any merchandise processing fees, for which)"; and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(2) copies of all applicable certificates or certifications of origin; and"

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—In the case of a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendments made by subsection (a) to section 520(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1520(d)) shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(B) section 520(d) of such Act, as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

SEC. 206. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 508 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) EXPORTS AND IMPORTS RELATING TO USMCA COUNTRIES.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) USMCA; USMCA COUNTRY.—The terms 'USMCA' and 'USMCA country' have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.

"(B) USMCA CERTIFICATION OF ORIGIN.—The term 'USMCA certification of origin' means the certification established under article 5.2.1 of the USMCA that a good qualifies as an originating good under the USMCA.

"(2) EXPORTS TO USMCA COUNTRIES.—Any person who completes a USMCA certification of origin or provides a written representation for a good exported from the United States to a USMCA country shall make, keep, and, pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, render for examination and inspection, all records and supporting documents related to the origin of the good (including the certification or copies thereof), including records related to—

"(A) the purchase, cost, value, and shipping of, and payment for, the good;

"(B) the purchase, cost, value, and shipping of, and payment for, all materials, including indirect materials, used in the production of the good; and

"(C) the production of the good in the form in which it was exported or the production of the material in the form in which it was sold.

"(3) EXPORTS UNDER THE CANADIAN AGREEMENT.—Any person who exports, or who knowingly causes to be exported, any merchandise to Canada during such time as the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement is in force with respect to, and the United States applies that Agreement to, Canada shall make, keep, and render for examination and inspection such records (including certifications of origin or copies thereof) which pertain to the exportations.

"(4) IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any importer who claims preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA for a good imported into the United States from a USMCA country shall make, keep, and, pursuant to rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury of the Secretary of Labor, render for examination and inspection—

"(i) records and supporting documentation related to the importation;

"(ii) all records and supporting documents related to the origin of the good (including the certification or copies thereof), if the importer completed the certification; and

"(iii) records and supporting documents necessary to demonstrate that the good did not, while in transit to the United States,

undergo further production or any other operation other than unloading, reloading, or any other operation necessary to preserve the good in good condition or to transport the good to the United States.

"(B) VEHICLE PRODUCER.—Any vehicle producer whose good is the subject of a claim for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA shall make, keep, and, pursuant to rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Treasury and Secretary of Labor, render for examination and inspection records and supporting documents related to the labor value content and steel and aluminum purchasing requirements for the qualification of its vehicles for preferential treatment.

"(5) RETENTION PERIOD.—

"(A) EXPORTS TO USMCA COUNTRIES.—A person covered by paragraph (2) who completes a USMCA certification of origin or provides a written representation for a good exported from the United States to a USMCA country shall keep the records required by such paragraph relating to that certification of origin for a period of at least 5 years after the date on which the certification is completed.

"(B) EXPORTS UNDER CANADIAN AGREEMENT.—The records required by paragraph (3) shall be kept for such periods of time as the Secretary shall prescribe, except that—

"(i) no period of time for the retention of the records may exceed 5 years from the date of entry, filing of a reconciliation, or exportation, as appropriate; and

"(ii) records for any drawback claim shall be kept until the 3rd anniversary of the date of liquidation of the claim.

"(C) IMPORTS INTO THE UNITED STATES.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—An importer covered by paragraph (4)(A) shall keep the records and supporting documents required by such paragraph for a period of at least 5 years after the date of importation of the good.

"(ii) VEHICLE PRODUCER.—A vehicle producer covered by paragraph (4)(B) shall keep the records and supporting documents required by paragraph (4)(B) for a period of at least 5 years after the date of filing the certifications required under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 202A(c) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act."

(2) by striking subsection (c); and

(3) in the paragraph heading for subsection (e)(1), by striking "NAFTA" and inserting "USMCA".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—

(A) EXPORTS.—Paragraphs (2) and (5)(A) of section 508(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to a good exported from the United States on or after the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(B) IMPORTS.—Paragraphs (4) and (5)(C) of section 508(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by subsection (a), shall apply with respect to a good that is entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

(3) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—

(A) EXPORTS.—In the case of a good exported from the United States before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(i) the amendments made by subsection (a) to paragraphs (2) and (5)(A) of section 508(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508) shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(ii) section 508 of such Act, as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

(B) IMPORTS.—In the case of a good that is entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, before the date on which the USMCA enters into force, the amendments made by subsection (a) to paragraphs (4) and (5)(C) of section 508(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508) shall not apply with respect to the good.

SEC. 207. ACTIONS REGARDING VERIFICATION OF CLAIMS UNDER THE USMCA.

(a) VERIFICATION.—

(1) ORIGIN VERIFICATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may, pursuant to article 5.9 of the USMCA, conduct a verification of whether a good is an originating good under section 202 or 202A.

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—If the Secretary conducts a verification under subparagraph (A), the President may direct the Secretary—

(i) during the verification process, to release the good only upon payment of duties or provision of security; and

(ii) if the Secretary makes a negative determination under subsection (b), to take action under subsection (c).

(2) TEXTILE AND APPAREL GOODS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may, pursuant to article 6.6 of the USMCA, conduct a verification described in subparagraph (C) with respect to a textile or apparel good.

(B) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—If the Secretary conducts a verification under subparagraph (A) with respect to a textile or apparel good, the President may direct the Secretary—

(i) during the verification process, to take appropriate action described in subparagraph (D); and

(ii) if the Secretary makes a negative determination described in subsection (b), to take action under subsection (c).

(C) VERIFICATION DESCRIBED.—A verification described in this subparagraph with respect to a textile or apparel good is—

(i) a verification of whether the good qualifies for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA; or

(ii) a verification of whether customs offenses are occurring or have occurred with respect to the good.

(D) ACTION DURING VERIFICATION.—Appropriate action described in this subparagraph may consist of—

(i) release of the textile or apparel good that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C) upon payment of duties or provision of security;

(ii) suspension of preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA with respect to—

(I) the textile or apparel good that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C)(i), if the Secretary determines that there is insufficient information to support the claim for preferential tariff treatment; or

(II) any textile or apparel good exported or produced by a person that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C)(ii) if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that there is insufficient information to support the claim for preferential tariff treatment made with respect to that good;

(iii) denial of preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA with respect to—

(I) the textile or apparel good that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C)(i) if the Secretary determines that incorrect information has been provided to support the claim for preferential tariff treatment; or

(II) any textile or apparel good exported or produced by a person that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C)(ii) if the Secretary determines that the person has provided incorrect information to sup-

port the claim for preferential tariff treatment that has been made with respect to that good;

(iv) detention of any textile or apparel good exported or produced by a person that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C) if the Secretary determines that there is insufficient information to determine the country of origin of that good; and

(v) denial of entry into the United States of any textile or apparel good exported or produced by a person that is the subject of a verification described in subparagraph (C) if the Secretary determines that the person has provided incorrect information regarding the country of origin of that good.

(b) NEGATIVE DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A negative determination described in this subsection with respect to a good imported, exported, or produced by an importer, exporter, or producer is a determination by the Secretary, based on a verification conducted under subsection (a), that—

(A) a claim by the importer, exporter, or producer that the good qualifies as an originating good under section 202 is inaccurate; or

(B) the good does not qualify for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA because—

(i) the importer, exporter, or producer failed to respond to a written request for information or failed to provide sufficient information to determine that the good qualifies as an originating good;

(ii) after receipt of a written notification for a visit to conduct verification under subsection (a), the exporter or producer did not provide written consent for that visit;

(iii) the importer, exporter, or producer does not maintain, or denies access to, records or documentation required under section 508(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1508(1));

(iv) in the case of verification conducted under subsection (a)(2)—

(I) access or permission for a site visit is denied;

(II) officials of the United States are prevented from completing a site visit on the proposed date and the exporter or producer does not provide an acceptable alternative date for the site visit; or

(III) the exporter or producer does not provide access to relevant documents or facilities during a site visit; or

(v) the importer, exporter, or producer—

(I) otherwise fails to comply with the requirements of this section; or

(II) based on the preponderance of the evidence, circumvents the requirements of this section.

(2) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—The Secretary shall not make a negative determination described in paragraph (1)(B) unless—

(A) in a case in which the Secretary conducts a verification with respect to a good by written request or questionnaire submitted to the importer under article 5.9.1(a) of the USMCA and the claim for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA is based on a certification of origin completed by the exporter or producer of the good, the Secretary requests information from the exporter or producer that completed the certification; or

(B) in a case in which the Secretary conducts a verification with respect to a textile or apparel good by requesting a site visit under article 6.6.2 of the USMCA, the Secretary requests information from the importer and from any exporter or producer that provided information to the Secretary to support the claim for preferential tariff treatment.

(c) ACTION BASED ON DETERMINATION.—

(1) DENIAL OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Upon making a negative determination described in subsection (b)(1) with respect to a good, the Secretary may deny preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA with respect to the good.

(2) WITHHOLDING OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT BASED ON PATTERN OF CONDUCT.—If verifications of origin relating to identical goods indicate a pattern of conduct by an importer, exporter, or producer of false or unsupported representations relevant to a claim that a good imported into the United States qualifies for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, may withhold preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA for entries of those goods imported, exported, or produced by that person until U.S. Customs and Border Protection determines that person has established compliance with requirements for claims for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA.

(d) PREVENTION OF CIRCUMVENTION.—In making a determination under this section, including whether to accept or reject a claim for preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA, the Secretary shall interpret the requirements of this section in a manner to avoid and prevent circumvention of those requirements.

SEC. 208. DRAWBACK [RESERVED].

SEC. 209. OTHER AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930.

(a) COUNTRY OF ORIGIN MARKING.—Section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1304) is amended by striking subsection (k) and inserting the following:

“(k) TREATMENT OF GOODS OF A USMCA COUNTRY.—In applying this section to an article that qualifies as a good of a USMCA country (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)—

“(1) the exemption under subsection (a)(3)(H) shall be applied by substituting ‘reasonably know’ for ‘necessarily know’;

“(2) the Secretary shall exempt the good from the requirements for marking under subsection (a) if the good—

“(A) is an original work of art; or

“(B) is provided for under subheading 6904.10, heading 8541, or heading 8542 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; and

“(3) subsection (b) does not apply to the usual container of any good described in subsection (a)(3)(E) or (I) or paragraph (2)(A) or (B) of this subsection.”

(b) EXAMINATION OF BOOKS AND WITNESSES.—Section 509(a)(2)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1509(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by inserting at the end “or a vehicle producer whose good is subject to a claim of preferential tariff treatment under the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act).”; and

(2) in clause (ii), by striking “a NAFTA country” and all that follows through “Implementation Act)” and inserting “a USMCA country (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”.

(c) EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.—Section 628 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1628) is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) GOVERNMENT AGENCY OF USMCA COUNTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may authorize U.S. Customs and Border Protection to exchange information with any government agency of a USMCA country, if the Secretary—

“(A) reasonably believes the exchange of information is necessary to implement chapter 2, 4, 5, 6, or 7 of the USMCA; and

“(B) obtains assurances from such agency that the information will be held in confidence and used only for governmental purposes.

“(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘USMCA’ and ‘USMCA country’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—In the case of a good entered for consumption, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(B) the provisions of law amended by this section, as such provisions were in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE RELATING TO EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (c), the Secretary of the Treasury shall retain the authority provided in section 628(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (as in effect on the day before the date on which the USMCA enters into force) to exchange information with any government agency of a NAFTA country (as defined in section 2 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (as in effect on the day before the date on which the USMCA enters into force)).

SEC. 210. REGULATIONS.

(a) SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out this title and the amendments made by this title (except as provided by subsection (b)).

(b) SECRETARY OF LABOR.—The Secretary of Labor shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the labor value content determination under section 202A.

TITLE III—APPLICATION OF USMCA TO SECTORS AND SERVICES

Subtitle A—Relief From Injury Caused by Import Competition [reserved]

Subtitle B—Temporary Entry of Business Persons [reserved]

Subtitle C—United States-Mexico Cross-border Long-haul Trucking Services

SEC. 321. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) BORDER COMMERCIAL ZONE.—The term “border commercial zone” means—

(A) the area of United States territory of the municipalities along the United States-Mexico international border and the commercial zones of such municipalities as described in subpart B of part 372 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations; and

(B) any additional border crossing and associated commercial zones listed in the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration OP-2 application instructions or successor documents.

(2) CARGO ORIGINATING IN MEXICO.—The term “cargo originating in Mexico” means any cargo that enters the United States by commercial motor vehicle from Mexico, including cargo that may have originated in a country other than Mexico.

(3) CHANGE IN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The term “change in circumstance” may include a

substantial increase in services supplied by the grantee of a grant of authority.

(4) COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term “commercial motor vehicle” means a commercial motor vehicle, as such term is defined in paragraph (1) of section 31132 of title 49, United States Code, that meets the requirements of subparagraph (A) of such paragraph.

(5) CROSS-BORDER LONG-HAUL TRUCKING SERVICES.—The term “cross-border long-haul trucking services” means—

(A) the transportation by commercial motor vehicle of cargo originating in Mexico to a point in the United States outside of a border commercial zone; or

(B) the transportation by commercial motor vehicle of cargo originating in the United States from a point in the United States outside of a border commercial zone to a point in a border commercial zone or a point in Mexico.

(6) DRIVER.—The term “driver” means a person that drives a commercial motor vehicle in cross-border long-haul trucking services.

(7) GRANT OF AUTHORITY.—The term “grant of authority” means registration granted pursuant to section 13902 of title 49, United States Code, or a successor provision, to persons of Mexico to conduct cross-border long-haul trucking services in the United States.

(8) INTERESTED PARTY.—The term “interested party” means—

(A) persons of the United States engaged in the provision of cross-border long-haul trucking services;

(B) a trade or business association, a majority of whose members are part of the relevant United States long-haul trucking services industry;

(C) a certified or recognized union, or representative group of suppliers, operators, or drivers who are part of the United States long-haul trucking services industry;

(D) the Government of Mexico; or

(E) persons of Mexico.

(9) MATERIAL HARM.—The term “material harm” means a significant loss in the share of the United States market or relevant submarket for cross-border long-haul trucking services held by persons of the United States.

(10) OPERATOR OR SUPPLIER.—The term “operator” or “supplier” means an entity that has been granted registration under section 13902 of title 49, United States Code, to provide cross-border long-haul trucking services.

(11) PERSONS OF MEXICO.—The term “persons of Mexico” includes—

(A) entities domiciled in Mexico organized, or otherwise constituted under Mexican law, including subsidiaries of United States companies domiciled in Mexico, or entities owned or controlled by a Mexican national, which conduct cross-border long-haul trucking services, or employ drivers who are non-United States nationals; and

(B) drivers who are Mexican nationals.

(12) PERSONS OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term “persons of the United States” includes entities domiciled in the United States, organized or otherwise constituted under United States law, and not owned or controlled by persons of Mexico, which provide cross-border long-haul trucking services and long-haul commercial motor vehicle drivers who are United States nationals.

(13) THREAT OF MATERIAL HARM.—The term “threat of material harm” means material harm that is likely to occur.

(14) UNITED STATES LONG-HAUL TRUCKING SERVICES INDUSTRY.—The term “United States long-haul trucking services industry” means—

(A) United States suppliers, operators, or drivers as a whole providing cross-border long-haul trucking services; or

(B) United States suppliers, operators, or drivers providing cross-border long-haul trucking services in a specific sub-market of the whole United States market.

SEC. 322. INVESTIGATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS BY COMMISSION.

(a) INVESTIGATION.—Upon the filing of a petition by an interested party described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 321(8) which is representative of a United States long-haul trucking services industry, or at the request of the President or the Trade Representative, or upon the resolution of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the International Trade Commission (in this subtitle referred to as the “Commission”) shall promptly initiate an investigation to determine—

(1) whether a request by a person of Mexico to receive a grant of authority that is pending as of the date of the filing of the petition threatens to cause material harm to a United States long-haul trucking services industry;

(2) whether a person of Mexico who has received a grant of authority on or after the date of entry into force of the USMCA and retains such grant of authority is causing or threatens to cause material harm to a United States long-haul trucking services industry; or

(3) whether, with respect to a person of Mexico who has received a grant of authority before the date of entry into force of the USMCA and retains such grant of authority, there has been a change in circumstances such that such person of Mexico is causing or threatens to cause material harm to a United States long-haul trucking services industry.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF PETITION, REQUEST, OR RESOLUTION.—The Commission shall transmit a copy of any petition, request, or resolution filed under subsection (a) to the Trade Representative and the Secretary of Transportation.

(c) PUBLICATION AND HEARINGS.—The Commission shall—

(1) promptly publish notice of the commencement of any investigation under subsection (a) in the Federal Register; and

(2) within a reasonable time period thereafter, hold public hearings at which the Commission shall afford interested parties an opportunity to be present, to present evidence, to respond to presentations of other parties, and otherwise to be heard.

(d) FACTORS APPLIED IN MAKING DETERMINATIONS.—In making a determination under subsection (a) of whether a request by a person of Mexico to receive a grant of authority, or a person of Mexico who has received a grant of authority and retains such grant of authority, as the case may be, threatens to cause material harm to a United States long-haul trucking services industry, the Commission shall—

(1) consider, among other things, and as relevant—

(A) the volume and tonnage of merchandise transported; and

(B) the employment, wages, hours of service, and working conditions; and

(2) with respect to a change in circumstances described in subsection (a)(3), take into account those operations by persons of Mexico under grants of authority in effect as of the date of entry into force of the USMCA are not causing material harm.

(e) ASSISTANCE TO COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Commission, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall consult with the Commission

and shall collect and maintain such additional data and other information on commercial motor vehicles entering or exiting the United States at a port of entry or exit at the United States border with Mexico as the Commission may request for the purpose of conducting investigations under subsection (a) and shall make such information available to the Commission in a timely manner.

(2) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the Commission, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Transportation, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, and the head of any other Federal agency shall make available to the Commission any information in their possession, including proprietary information, as the Commission may require in order to assist the Commission in making determinations under subsection (a).

(B) CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION.—The Commission shall treat any proprietary information obtained under subparagraph (A) as confidential business information in accordance with regulations adopted by the Commission to carry out this subtitle.

(f) LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDER.—The Commission shall promulgate regulations to provide access to confidential business information under protective order to authorized representatives of interested parties who are parties to an investigation under subsection (a).

(g) DEADLINE FOR DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date on which an investigation is initiated under subsection (a) with respect to a petition, request, or resolution, the Commission shall make a determination with respect to the petition, request, or resolution.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If, before the 100th day after an investigation is initiated under subsection (a), the Commission determines that the investigation is extraordinarily complicated, the Commission shall make its determination with respect to the investigation not later than 150 days after the date referred to in paragraph (1).

(h) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—For purposes of this subtitle, the provisions of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 330(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(d)) shall be applied with respect to determinations and findings made under this section as if such determinations and findings were made under section 202 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252).

SEC. 323. COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If the Commission makes an affirmative determination under section 322, the Commission shall recommend the action that is necessary to address the material harm or threat of material harm found.

(b) LIMITATION.—Only those members of the Commission who agreed to the affirmative determination under section 322 are eligible to vote on the recommendation required to be made under subsection (a).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 60 days after the date on which the determination is made under section 322, the Commission shall submit to the President a report that includes—

(1) the determination and an explanation of the basis for the determination;

(2) if the determination is affirmative, recommendations for action and an explanation of the basis for the recommendation; and

(3) any dissenting or separate views by members of the Commission regarding the determination.

(d) PUBLIC NOTICE.—Upon submitting a report to the President under subsection (c), the Commission shall—

(1) promptly make public the report (with the exception of information which the Commission determines to be confidential business information); and

(2) publish a summary of the report in the Federal Register.

SEC. 324. ACTION BY PRESIDENT WITH RESPECT TO AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the date that is 30 days after the date on which the President receives a report of the Commission in which the Commission's determination under section 322 is affirmative or which contains a determination that the President may treat as affirmative in accordance with section 330(d)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(d)(1))—

(1) the President shall, subject to subsection (b), issue an order to the Secretary of Transportation specifying the relief to be provided, consistent with subsection (c), and directing the relief to be carried out; and

(2) the Secretary of Transportation shall carry out such relief.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The President is not required to provide relief under this section if the President determines that provision of such relief—

(1) is not in the national economic interest of the United States; or

(2) would cause serious harm to the national security of the United States.

(c) NATURE OF RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The relief the President is authorized to provide under this subsection is as follows:

(A)(i) With respect to a determination relating to an investigation under section 322(a)(1), the denial or imposition of limitations on a request for a new grant of authority by the persons of Mexico that are the subject of the investigation.

(ii) With respect to a determination relating to an investigation under section 322(a)(1), the revocation of, or restrictions on, grants of authority issued to the persons of Mexico that are the subject of the investigation since the date of the petition, request, or resolution.

(B) With respect to a determination relating to an investigation under section 322(a)(2) or (3), the revocation or imposition of limitations on an existing grant of authority by the persons of Mexico that are the subject of the investigation.

(C) With respect to a determination relating to an investigation under section 322(a)(1), (2), or (3), a cap on the number of grants of authority issued to persons of Mexico annually.

(2) DEADLINE FOR RELIEF.—Not later than 15 days after the date on which the President determines the relief to be provided under this subsection, the President shall direct the Secretary of Transportation to carry out the relief.

(d) PERIOD OF RELIEF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), any relief that the President provides under this section may not be in effect for more than 2 years.

(2) EXTENSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (C), the President, after receiving a determination from the Commission under subparagraph (B) that is affirmative, or which contains a determination that the President may treat as affirmative in accordance with section 330(d)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1330(d)(1)(1)), may extend the effective period of relief provided under this section by up to an additional 4 years, if the President determines that the provision of the relief continues to be necessary to remedy or prevent material harm.

(B) ACTION BY COMMISSION.—

(i) INVESTIGATION.—Upon request of the President, or upon the filing by an interested

party described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 321(8) which is representative of a United States long-haul trucking services industry that is filed with the Commission not earlier than the date that is 270 days, and not later than the date that is 240 days, before the date on which any action taken under this section is to terminate, the Commission shall conduct an investigation to determine whether action under this section continues to be necessary to remedy or prevent material harm.

(ii) NOTICE AND HEARING.—The Commission shall—

(I) publish notice of the commencement of an investigation under clause (i) in the Federal Register; and

(II) within a reasonable time thereafter, hold a public hearing at which the Commission shall afford interested parties an opportunity to be present, to present evidence, and to respond to the presentations of other parties and consumers, and otherwise be heard.

(iii) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 60 days before relief provided under subsection (a) is to terminate, or such other date as determined by the President, the Commission shall submit to the President a report on its investigation and determination under this subparagraph.

(C) PERIOD OF RELIEF.—Any relief provided under this section, including any extension thereof, may not, in the aggregate, be in effect for more than 6 years.

(D) LIMITATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Commission may not conduct an investigation under subparagraph (B)(i) if—

(I) the subject matter of the investigation is the same as the subject matter of a previous investigation conducted under subparagraph (B)(i); and

(II) less than 1 year has elapsed since the Commission made its report to the President of the results of such previous investigation.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—Clause (i) shall not apply with respect to an investigation if the Commission determines good cause exists to conduct the investigation.

(e) REGULATIONS.—The Commission and the Secretary of Transportation are authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this subtitle.

SEC. 325. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION.

Section 202(a)(8) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2252(a)(8)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “and title III of the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act” and inserting “, title III of the United States-Panama Trade Promotion Agreement Implementation Act, and subtitle C of title III of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act”.

SEC. 326. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) REGISTRATION OF MOTOR CARRIERS.—Section 13902 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(j) MEXICO-DOMICILED MOTOR CARRIERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, upon an order in accordance with section 324(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act, the Secretary shall carry out the relief specified by denying or imposing limitations on a request for registration or capping the number of requests for registration by Mexico-domiciled motor carriers of cargo to operate beyond the municipalities along the United States-Mexico international border and the commercial zones of those municipalities as directed.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE PERIODS OF REGISTRATION.—Section 13905 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“(g) MEXICO-DOMICILED MOTOR CARRIERS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, upon an order in accordance with section 324(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act, the Secretary shall carry out the relief specified by revoking or imposing limitations on existing registrations of Mexico-domiciled motor carriers of cargo to operate beyond the municipalities along the United States-Mexico international border and the commercial zones of those municipalities as directed.”.

SEC. 327. SURVEY OF OPERATING AUTHORITIES.

The Department of Transportation shall undertake a survey of all existing grants of operating authority to, and pending applications for operating authority from, all Mexico-domiciled motor property carriers for operating beyond the Border Commercial Zones, including OP-1 (MX) operating authority (Mexico-domiciled Carriers for Motor Carrier Authority to Operate Beyond U.S. Municipalities and Commercial Zones on the U.S.-Mexico Border) and OP-1 operating authority (United States-based Enterprise Carrier of International Cargo Application for Motor Property Carrier and Broker Authority). The Department of Transportation shall prepare a report summarizing the results of such survey not less than 180 days after the date on which the USMCA enters into force, which it shall deliver to the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Commission, and the Chairs and Ranking Members of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

TITLE IV—ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

Subtitle A—Preventing Duty Evasion

SEC. 401. COOPERATION ON DUTY EVASION.

Section 414(b) of the Enforce and Protect Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4374(b)) is amended—

(1) by inserting “or a party to the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)” after “subsection (a)”; and

(2) by inserting “or the USMCA, as the case may be,” after “the bilateral agreement”.

Subtitle B—Dispute Settlement [reserved]

Subtitle C—Conforming Amendments

SEC. 421. JUDICIAL REVIEW IN ANTIDUMPING DUTY AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY CASES.

Section 516A of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)(vii), by striking “the Tariff Act of 1930” and inserting “this Act”; and

(B) in paragraph (5)(D)(i), by striking “article 1904 of the NAFTA” and inserting “article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(2) in subsection (b)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “NAFTA OR UNITED STATES-CANADA” and inserting “UNITED STATES-CANADA OR USMCA”; and

(B) in the text, by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (6)(A), by striking “article 1908 of the NAFTA” and inserting “article 10.16 of the USMCA”;

(B) in paragraph (7)(A), by striking “article 1908 of the NAFTA” and inserting “article 10.16 of the USMCA”;

(C) by striking paragraph (8);

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (9) and (10) as paragraphs (8) and (9), respectively;

(E) in paragraph (9), as redesignated by subparagraph (D), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) Canada for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to, and the United States applies the USMCA to, Canada.

“(B) Mexico for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to, and the United States applies the USMCA to, Mexico.”; and

(F) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) USMCA.—The term ‘USMCA’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.”;

(4) in subsection (g)—

(A) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(B) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement.” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA.”;

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “the Agreement or the USMCA”;

(iii) in clause (v), by striking “paragraph 12 of article 1905 of the NAFTA” and inserting “article 10.13 of the USMCA”; and

(iv) in clause (vi), by striking “paragraph 12 of article 1905 of the NAFTA” and inserting “article 10.13 of the USMCA”;

(C) in paragraph (4)(A), by striking “the North American Free Trade Agreement” and all that follows through “chapter 19 of the Agreement” and inserting “the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1988 implementing the binational panel dispute settlement system under chapter 19 of the Agreement, or the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act implementing the binational panel dispute settlement system under chapter 10 of the USMCA”;

(D) in paragraph (5)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”; and

(II) in clause (iii), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or chapter 10 of the USMCA”;

(E) in paragraph (6), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(F) in paragraph (7)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “OF THE NAFTA OR THE AGREEMENT” and inserting “OF THE AGREEMENT OR ARTICLE 10.12 OF THE USMCA”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “the NAFTA or the Agreement” and inserting “article 1904 of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(G) in paragraph (8)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”; and

(II) in clause (ii)—

(aa) in the clause heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”; and

(bb) in the text, by striking “paragraph 11(a) of article 1905 of the NAFTA” and inserting “article 10.13 of the USMCA”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking “of the NAFTA or the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(H) in paragraph (9), by striking “of the NAFTA or of the Agreement” and inserting “of the Agreement or chapter 10 of the USMCA”;

(I) in paragraph (10), by striking “the NAFTA or the Agreement” and inserting “the Agreement or under article 10.12 of the USMCA”;

(J) by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

“(11) SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF ARTICLE 10.12 OF THE USMCA.—

“(A) SUSPENSION.—If a special committee established under article 10.13 of the USMCA issues an affirmative finding, the Trade Representative may, in accordance with article 10.13 of the USMCA, suspend the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA.

“(B) TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION.—If a special committee is reconvened and makes an affirmative determination described in article 10.13 of the USMCA, any suspension of the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA shall terminate.”; and

(K) in paragraph (12)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”;

(ii) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) NOTICE OF SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF ARTICLE 10.12 OF THE USMCA.—

“(i) NOTICE OF SUSPENSION.—Upon notification by the Trade Representative or the government of a country described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (f)(9) that the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA has been suspended in accordance with article 10.13 of the USMCA, the United States Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of suspension of article 10.12 of the USMCA.

“(ii) NOTICE OF TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION.—Upon notification by the Trade Representative or the government of a country described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (f)(9) that the suspension of the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA is terminated in accordance with article 10.13 of the USMCA, the United States Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice of termination of suspension of article 10.12 of the USMCA.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in the subparagraph heading, by striking “ARTICLE 1904” and inserting “ARTICLE 10.12 OF THE USMCA”; and

(II) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “If” and all that follows through “NAFTA—” and inserting the following: “If the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA is suspended in accordance with article 10.13 of the USMCA—”;

(iv) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “if the United States” and all that follows through “NAFTA—” and inserting the following: “if the United States made an allegation under article 10.13 of the USMCA and the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA was suspended pursuant to article 10.13 of the USMCA—”;

(bb) in subclause (I), by striking “subsection (f)(10)(A) or (B)” and inserting “subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (f)(9)”; and

(II) in clause (ii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “if a country” and all that follows through “NAFTA—” and inserting the following: “if a country described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (f)(9)

made an allegation under article 10.13 of the USMCA and the operation of article 10.12 of the USMCA was suspended pursuant to article 10.13 of the USMCA—"; and

(v) in subparagraph (D)(i), by striking "a country described" and all that follows through "NAFTA" and inserting "a country described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (f)(9) pursuant to article 10.13 of the USMCA".

SEC. 422. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER PROVISIONS OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930.

(a) DISCLOSURE OF PROPRIETARY INFORMATION UNDER PROTECTIVE ORDERS.—Section 777(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677f(f)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking "NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT OR THE UNITED STATES-CANADA AGREEMENT" and inserting "THE UNITED STATES-CANADA AGREEMENT OR THE USMCA";

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "article 1904 of the NAFTA" and all that follows through "the administering authority" and inserting "article 1904 of the United States-Canada Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA, or an extraordinary challenge committee is convened under Annex 1904.13 of the United States-Canada Agreement or chapter 10 of the USMCA, the administering authority"; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking "chapter 19 of the NAFTA or the Agreement" each place it appears and inserting "chapter 19 of the Agreement or chapter 10 of the USMCA";

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking "the NAFTA or the United States-Canada Agreement" and inserting "article 1904 of the United States-Canada Agreement or article 10.12 of the USMCA";

(4) in paragraph (4), by striking "section 402(b) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act" and inserting "section 412(b) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act"; and

(5) by striking "section 516A(f)(10)" each place it appears and inserting "section 516A(f)(9)".

(b) DEFINITION.—Section 771 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677) is amended by striking paragraph (22) and inserting the following:

"(22) USMCA.—The term 'USMCA' has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act."

SEC. 423. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.—Chapter 95 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1581(i)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively;

(B) by inserting "(1)" after "(i)";

(C) in subparagraph (D), as redesignated by subparagraph (A), by striking "paragraphs (1)–(3) of this subsection" and inserting "subparagraphs (A) through (C) of this paragraph"; and

(D) by striking the flush text and inserting the following:

"(2) This subsection shall not confer jurisdiction over an antidumping or countervailing duty determination which is reviewable by—

"(A) the Court of International Trade under section 516A(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a(a)); or

"(B) a binational panel under section 516A(g) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a(g)).";

(2) in section 1584, by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

"§ 1584. Civil actions under the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement or the USMCA";

and

(3) in the table of sections at the beginning of the chapter, by striking the item relating to section 1584 and inserting the following:

"1584. Civil actions under the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement or the USMCA.".

(b) PARTICULAR PROCEEDINGS.—Sections 2201(a) and 2643(c)(5) of title 28, United States Code, are each amended by striking "section 516A(f)(10)" and inserting "section 516A(f)(9)".

Subtitle D—General Provisions

SEC. 431. EFFECT OF TERMINATION OF USMCA COUNTRY STATUS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), on the date on which a country ceases to be a USMCA country, the provisions of this title (other than this section) and the amendments made by this title shall cease to have effect with respect to that country.

(b) TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—

(1) PROCEEDINGS REGARDING PROTECTIVE ORDERS AND UNDERTAKINGS.—If on the date on which a country ceases to be a USMCA country an investigation or enforcement proceeding concerning the violation of a protective order issued under section 777(f) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (as amended by this title) or an undertaking of the government of that country is pending, the investigation or proceeding shall continue, and sanctions may continue to be imposed, in accordance with the provisions of such section 777(f) (as so amended).

(2) BINATIONAL PANEL AND EXTRAORDINARY CHALLENGE COMMITTEE REVIEWS.—If on the date on which a country ceases to be a USMCA country—

(A) a binational panel review under article 10.12 of the USMCA is pending, or has been requested, or

(B) an extraordinary challenge committee review under that article is pending, or has been requested,

with respect to a determination which involves a class or kind of merchandise and to which subsection (g)(2) of section 516A of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a) applies, such determination shall be reviewable under subsection (a) of that section. In the case of a determination to which the provisions of this paragraph apply, the time limits for commencing an action under 516A(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 shall not begin to run until the date on which the USMCA ceases to be in force with respect to that country.

SEC. 432. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this title and the amendments made by this title shall take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force, but shall not apply—

(1) to any final determination described in paragraph (1)(B) or clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (2)(B) of section 516A(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a(a)) notice of which is published in the Federal Register before such date, or to a determination described in paragraph (2)(B)(vi) of that section notice of which is received by the Government of Canada or Mexico before such date; or

(2) to any binational panel review under NAFTA, or any extraordinary challenge arising out of any such review, that was commenced before such date.

TITLE V—TRANSFER PROVISIONS AND OTHER AMENDMENTS

SEC. 501. DRAWBACK.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 208 of this Act is amended in the section heading by striking "[RESERVED]".

(b) USMCA DRAWBACK.—Subsection (a) of section 203 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3333) is—

(1) transferred to section 208 of this Act;

(2) inserted after the section heading for that section (as amended by subsection (a)); and

(3) amended—

(A) by striking "NAFTA country" each place it appears and inserting "USMCA country";

(B) in the subsection heading, by striking "NAFTA" and inserting "USMCA";

(C) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "and the amendments made by subsection (b)"; and

(ii) by striking "NAFTA drawback" and inserting "USMCA drawback";

(D) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "sorting, marking," after "repacking,"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking "paragraph 12 of section A of Annex 703.2 of the Agreement" and inserting "paragraph 11 of Annex 3-B of the USMCA"; and

(E) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

"(6) A good provided for in subheading 1701.13.20 or 1701.14.20 of the HTS that is imported under any re-export program or any like program and that is—

"(A) used as a material, or

"(B) substituted for by a good of the same kind and quality that is used as a material, in the production of a good provided for in existing Canadian tariff item 1701.99.00 or existing Mexican tariff item 1701.99.01, 1701.99.02, or 1701.99.99 (relating to refined sugar)."

(c) SAME KIND AND QUALITY.—Section 208 of this Act, as amended by subsection (b), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(b) SAME KIND AND QUALITY.—For purposes of paragraphs (3)(A)(iii), (5)(C), (6)(B), and (8) of subsection (a), and for purposes of obtaining refunds, waivers, or reductions of customs duties with respect to a good subject to USMCA drawback under section 313(n)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313(n)(2)), a good is a good of the same kind and quality as another good—

"(1) for a good described in such paragraph (6)(B), if the good would have been considered of the same kind and quality as the other good on the day before the date on which the USMCA enters into force; or

"(2) for other goods if—

"(A) the good is classified under the same 8-digit HTS subheading number as the other good; or

"(B) drawback would be allowed with respect to the goods under subsection (b)(4), (j)(1), or (p) of section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313)."

(d) CERTAIN FEES; INAPPLICABILITY TO COUNTERVAILING AND ANTIDUMPING DUTIES.—Subsections (d) and (e) of section 203 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3333) are—

(1) transferred to section 208 of this Act;

(2) inserted after subsection (b) of section 208 (as added by subsection (c));

(3) redesignated as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(4) amended, in subsection (c) (as redesignated by paragraph (3)), by striking "exported to" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "exported to a USMCA country.".

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) BONDED MANUFACTURING WAREHOUSES.—Section 311 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1311) is amended, in the eleventh paragraph—

(A) by striking "NAFTA" each place it appears;

(B) by striking “section 203(a) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act” and inserting “section 208(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act”; and

(C) by striking “section 2(4) of that Act” and inserting “section 3 of that Act”.

(2) BONDED SMELTING AND REFINING WAREHOUSES.—Section 312 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1312) is amended, in subsections (b) and (d)—

(A) by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”;

(B) by striking “section 2(4) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act” each place it appears and inserting “section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act”; and

(C) by striking “section 203(a) of that Act” each place it appears and inserting “section 208(a) of that Act”.

(3) DRAWBACK AND REFUNDS.—Section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1313) is amended—

(A) in subsection (j)(4), by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A)(i) Effective upon the entry into force of the USMCA, the exportation to a USMCA country of merchandise that is fungible with and substituted for imported merchandise, other than merchandise described in paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 208(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act, shall not constitute an exportation for purposes of paragraph (2).

“(ii) In this subparagraph, the terms ‘USMCA’ and ‘USMCA country’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.”;

(B) in subsection (n)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) the term ‘USMCA country’ has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act;

“(B) the term ‘good subject to USMCA drawback’ has the meaning given that term in section 208(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act”; and

(ii) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”; and

(C) in subsection (o), by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”.

(4) MANIPULATION IN WAREHOUSE.—Section 562 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1562) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) without payment of duties for exportation to a USMCA country, as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act, if the merchandise is of a kind described in any of paragraphs (1) through (8) of section 208(a) of that Act”;;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “section 203(a) of that Act” and inserting “section 208(a) of that Act”; and

(ii) by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”; and

(C) in paragraphs (3) and (4), by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”.

(5) FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.—Section 3(a)(2) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly known as the “Foreign Trade Zones Act”) (19 U.S.C. 81c(a)(2)) is amended, in the flush text—

(A) by striking “goods subject to NAFTA drawback, as defined in section 203(a) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Im-

plementation Act” and inserting “goods subject to USMCA drawback, as defined in section 208(a) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act”;

(B) by striking “a NAFTA country, as defined in section 2(4) of that Act” and inserting “a USMCA country, as defined in section 3 of that Act”; and

(C) by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”.

(F) ADDITIONAL CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for this Act is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 208. Drawback.”.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each transfer, redesignation, and amendment made by subsections (b) through (e) shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a good entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.—In the case of a good entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendments made by subsections (b) through (e) shall not apply with respect to the good; and

(B) the provisions of law amended by such subsections, as such provisions were in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the good.

SEC. 502. RELIEF FROM INJURY CAUSED BY IMPORT COMPETITION.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Subtitle A of title III of this Act is amended in the subtitle heading by striking “[**reserved**]”.

(b) ARTICLE IMPACT IN IMPORT RELIEF CASES.—Section 311 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3371) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle A of title III of this Act;

(2) inserted after the heading (as amended by subsection (a)) of such subtitle;

(3) redesignated as section 301; and

(4) amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”;

(B) in subsection (c), by striking “section 312(a)” and inserting “section 302(a)”; and

(C) by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”.

(c) PRESIDENTIAL ACTION REGARDING IMPORTS.—Section 312 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3372) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle A of title III of this Act;

(2) inserted after section 301 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (b));

(3) redesignated as section 302; and

(4) amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”;

(B) in subsection (b), in the subsection heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”;

(C) in subsection (c), in the subsection heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”; and

(D) by striking “NAFTA” each place it appears and inserting “USMCA”.

(d) ADDITIONAL CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is amended by striking the item relating to subtitle A of title III and inserting the following:

“Subtitle A—Relief From Injury Caused by Import Competition

“Sec. 301. USMCA article impact in import relief cases under the Trade Act of 1974.

“Sec. 302. Presidential action regarding USMCA imports.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each transfer, redesignation, and amendment made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to an investigation under chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2251 et seq.) initiated on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA.—In the case of an investigation under chapter 1 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 initiated before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the transfers, redesignations, and amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to the investigation; and

(B) sections 311 and 312 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3371 and 3372), as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the investigation.

SEC. 503. TEMPORARY ENTRY.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Subtitle B of title III of this Act is amended in the subtitle heading by striking “[**reserved**]”.

(b) NONIMMIGRANT TRADERS AND INVESTORS.—Section 341 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 103-182; 107 Stat. 2116) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title III of this Act;

(2) inserted after the heading (as amended by subsection (a)) of such subtitle;

(3) redesignated as section 311; and

(4) amended—

(A) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(B) by striking “(a)” and all that follows through “Upon” and inserting “Upon”;

(C) by striking “the Agreement” each place it appears and inserting “the USMCA”;

(D) by striking “Annex 1603” and inserting “Annex 16-A”; and

(E) by striking “Annex 1608” and inserting “article 16.1”.

(c) NONIMMIGRANT PROFESSIONALS.—Section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (3), (4), and (5);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (6) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (1), as redesignated by subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “Annex 1603 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (in this subsection referred to as ‘NAFTA’)” and inserting “Annex 16-A of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”; and

(ii) by striking the third and fourth sentences and inserting the following: “For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘citizen of Mexico’ means ‘citizen’ as defined in article 16.1 of the USMCA.”; and

(2) in subsection (j)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking “Annex 1603 of the North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “Annex 16-A of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”; and

(B) in the second sentence, by striking “article 1603 of such Agreement” and inserting “article 16.4 of the USMCA”; and

(C) in the third sentence, by striking “Annex 1608 of such Agreement” and inserting “article 16.1 of the USMCA”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) INTEGRATED ENTRY AND EXIT DATA SYSTEM.—Section 110(c)(1)(B) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1365a(c)(1)(B)) is amended by striking “North American Free

Trade Agreement” and inserting “USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”.

(2) ENHANCED BORDER SECURITY AND VISA ENTRY REFORM ACT OF 2002.—Section 604 of the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Entry Reform Act of 2002 (8 U.S.C. 1773) is amended by striking “North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”.

(e) ADDITIONAL CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is amended by striking the item relating to subtitle A of title III and inserting the following:

“Subtitle B—Temporary Entry of Business Persons

“Sec. 311. Temporary entry.”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each transfer, redesignation, and amendment made by this section shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a visa issued on or after that date.

(2) TRANSITION FROM NAFTA.—In the case of a visa issued before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the transfers, redesignations, and amendments made by this section shall not apply with respect to the visa; and

(B) the provisions of law amended by subsections (b) through (d), as such provisions were in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the visa.

SEC. 504. DISPUTE SETTLEMENT IN ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY CASES.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Subtitle B of title IV of this Act is amended in the subtitle heading by striking “[reserved]”.

(b) REFERENCES IN SUBTITLE.—Section 401 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3431) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after the heading (as amended by subsection (a)) of such subtitle;

(2) redesignated as section 411; and

(3) amended by striking “the Agreement” and inserting “the USMCA”.

(c) ORGANIZATIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Section 402 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3432) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 411 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (b));

(2) redesignated as section 412; and

(3) amended—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (D), by striking “in paragraph 1” and all that follows and inserting “in paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1 and paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.3; and”;

(II) in subparagraph (E), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(III) in the matter following subparagraph (E), by striking “in paragraph 1” and all that follows through “Annex 1904.13” and inserting “in paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1 and paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.3”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in the paragraph heading, by striking “UNDER” and all that follows before the period; and

(II) in the text—

(aa) by striking “paragraph 1 of Annex 1901.2” and inserting “paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1”; and

(bb) by striking “chapter 19” each place it appears and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(cc) by striking “article 1905” and inserting “article 10.13”;

(B) in subsection (b)(1)—

(i) by striking “chapter 19” each place it appears and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(ii) by striking “article 1905” and inserting “article 10.13”;

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) by striking “chapter 19” each place it appears and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(II) by striking “article 1905” and inserting “article 10.13”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(I) by striking “chapter 19” each place it appears and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(II) in clause (i)(II), by striking “article 1905” and inserting “article 10.13”;

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “Annex 1901.2” and inserting “Annex 10-B.1”;

(II) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “under Annex 1904.13” and all that follows and inserting “under Annex 10-B.3 and special committees under article 10.13.”; and

(III) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(iv) in paragraph (4)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(II) in subparagraph (C)(iv)(III), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”;

(D) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “in paragraph 1” and all that follows and inserting “in paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1 and paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.3; or”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)—

(I) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “in paragraph 1” and all that follows through “during” and inserting “in paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1 and paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.3 during”;

(II) in subparagraph (A)(ii)—

(aa) by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(bb) by striking “the Agreement” and inserting “the USMCA”;

(III) in subparagraph (A)(iii), by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”;

(IV) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “in paragraph 1” and all that follows and inserting “in paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1 and paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.3; or”;

(V) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(iii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking “in paragraph 1” and all that follows through “during” and inserting “in paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.1 and paragraph 1 of Annex 10-B.3 during”;

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”;

(E) in subsection (e), in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “the Agreement” and inserting “the USMCA”;

(ii) by striking “between the United States” and all that follows through “NAFTA country”;

(iii) by striking “January 3, 1994” and inserting “January 3, 2020”;

(F) in subsection (f), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”;

(G) in subsection (g), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”; and

(H) in subsection (h), by striking “chapter 19” and inserting “chapter 10”.

(d) TESTIMONY AND PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.—Section 403 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3433) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 412 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (c));

(2) redesignated as section 413; and

(3) amended in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “under paragraph 13” and all that follows through “the committee—” and inserting “under paragraph 13 of article 10.12, and the allegations before the committee include a matter referred to in paragraph 13(a)(i) of article 10.12, for the purposes of carrying out its functions and duties under Annex 10-B.3, the committee—”.

(e) REQUESTS FOR REVIEW OF DETERMINATIONS.—Section 404 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3434) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 413 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (d));

(2) redesignated as section 414; and

(3) amended—

(A) in the section heading, by striking “OF NAFTA COUNTRIES”;

(B) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking “article 1911” and all that follows and inserting “article 10.8, of a USMCA country.”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking “article 1908” and inserting “article 10.16”;

(C) in subsection (b), by striking “article 1904” and inserting “article 10.12”; and

(D) in subsection (c), by striking “article 1904” each place it appears and inserting “article 10.12”.

(f) RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR PANELS AND COMMITTEES.—Section 405 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3435) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 414 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (e));

(2) redesignated as section 415; and

(3) amended—

(A) in subsection (a), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “article 1904” and inserting “article 10.12”;

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “Annex 1904.13” and inserting “Annex 10-B.3”; and

(C) in subsection (c), by striking “Annex 1905.6” and inserting “Annex 10-B.4”.

(g) SUBSIDY NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 406 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3436) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 415 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (f));

(2) redesignated as section 416; and

(3) amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “NAFTA country” and inserting “USMCA country”.

(h) IDENTIFICATION OF INDUSTRIES FACING SUBSIDIZED IMPORTS.—Section 407 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3437) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 416 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (g));

(2) redesignated as section 417; and

(3) amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking “the Agreement” and inserting “the USMCA”; and

(ii) by striking “NAFTA country” and inserting “USMCA country”;

(B) in subsection (c), in the matter following paragraph (3), by striking “NAFTA countries” and inserting “USMCA countries”; and

(C) in subsection (d)(3), by striking “the Agreement” and inserting “the USMCA”.

(i) TREATMENT OF AMENDMENTS TO LAW.—Section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438) is—

(1) transferred to subtitle B of title IV of this Act and inserted after section 417 (as inserted and redesignated by subsection (h));

(2) redesignated as section 418; and

(3) amended—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “the Agreement” and all that follows through “United States” and inserting “the USMCA”; and

(B) in the flush text, by striking “NAFTA country” and inserting “USMCA country”.

(j) **ADDITIONAL CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is amended by striking the item relating to subtitle B of title IV and inserting the following:

“Subtitle B—Dispute Settlement

“Sec. 411. References in subtitle.

“Sec. 412. Organizational and administrative provisions.

“Sec. 413. Testimony and production of papers in extraordinary challenges.

“Sec. 414. Requests for review of determination by competent investigating authorities.

“Sec. 415. Rules of procedure for panels and committees.

“Sec. 416. Subsidy negotiations.

“Sec. 417. Identification of industries facing subsidized imports.

“Sec. 418. Treatment of amendments to antidumping and countervailing duty law.”.

(k) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Each transfer, redesignation, and amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force, but shall not apply—

(A) to any final determination described in paragraph (1)(B) or clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (2)(B) of section 516A(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a(a)) notice of which is published in the Federal Register before such date, or to a determination described in paragraph (2)(B)(vi) of that section notice of which is received by the Government of Canada or Mexico before such date; and

(B) to any binational panel review under NAFTA, or any extraordinary challenge arising out of any such review, that was commenced before such date.

(2) **TRANSITION FROM NAFTA.**—The transfers, redesignations, and amendments made by this section shall not apply, and the provisions of title IV of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, as in effect on the day before the date on which the USMCA enters into force, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect—

(A) to any final determination described in paragraph (1)(B) or clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of paragraph (2)(B) of section 516A(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a(a)) notice of which is published in the Federal Register before such date, or to a determination described in paragraph (2)(B)(vi) of that section notice of which is received by the Government of Canada or Mexico before the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) to any binational panel review under NAFTA, or any extraordinary challenge arising out of any such review, that was commenced before the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

SEC. 505. GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT.

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY TO MODIFY DISCRIMINATORY PURCHASING REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 301 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “the North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “Annex 1001.1a-2 of the North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “Annex 13-A of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”; and

(B) by striking “chapter 10 of such Agreement” and inserting “chapter 13 of the USMCA”.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 308(4)(A)(ii) of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2518(4)(A)(ii)) is amended—

(1) by striking “a party to the North American Free Trade Agreement,” and inserting “Mexico, as a party to the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act),”; and

(2) by striking “the North American Free Trade Agreement for” and inserting “the USMCA for”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall—

(A) take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force; and

(B) apply with respect to a procurement on or after that date.

(2) **TRANSITION FROM NAFTA TREATMENT.**—In the case of a procurement before the date on which the USMCA enters into force—

(A) the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) to sections 301 and 308 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2511 and 2518) shall not apply with respect to the contract; and

(B) sections 301 and 308 of such Act, as in effect on the day before that date, shall continue to apply on and after that date with respect to the contract.

SEC. 506. ACTIONS AFFECTING UNITED STATES CULTURAL INDUSTRIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 182(f) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking “article 2106 of the North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “article 32.6 of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”; and

(2) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “article 2106 of the North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “article 32.6 of the USMCA”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

SEC. 507. REGULATORY TREATMENT OF URANIUM PURCHASES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1017(c) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 2296b-6(c)) is amended by striking “North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

SEC. 508. REPORT ON AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Trade Representative shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report setting forth a proposal for technical and conforming amendments to the laws under the jurisdiction of such committees, and other laws, necessary to fully carry out the provisions of, and amendments made by, this Act.

TITLE VI—TRANSITION TO AND EXTENSION OF USMCA

Subtitle A—Transitional Provisions

SEC. 601. REPEAL OF NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT.

The North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 103-182; 19 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) is repealed, effective on the date on which the USMCA enters into force.

SEC. 602. CONTINUED SUSPENSION OF THE UNITED STATES-CANADA FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT.

Section 501(c)(3) of the United States-Canada Free-Trade Agreement Implementation Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-449; 19 U.S.C. 2112 note) is amended—

(1) in the paragraph heading, by striking “NAFTA” and inserting “USMCA”; and

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “between them of the North American Free Trade Agreement” and inserting “of the USMCA (as defined in section 3 of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act)”.

Subtitle B—Joint Reviews Regarding Extension of USMCA

SEC. 611. PARTICIPATION IN JOINT REVIEWS WITH CANADA AND MEXICO REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE TERM OF THE USMCA AND OTHER ACTION REGARDING THE USMCA.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to the requirements of this section, the President shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees and stakeholders before each joint review, including consultation with respect to—

(1) any recommendation for action to be proposed at the review; and

(2) the decision whether or not to confirm that the United States wishes to extend the USMCA.

(b) **CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS AND STAKEHOLDERS.**—

(1) **PUBLICATION AND PUBLIC HEARING.**—At least 270 days before a joint review commences, the Trade Representative shall publish in the Federal Register a notice regarding the joint review and shall, as soon as possible following such publication, provide opportunity for the presentation of views relating to the operation of the USMCA, including a public hearing.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—At least 180 days before a 6-year joint review under article 34.7 of the USMCA commences, the Trade Representative shall report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding—

(A) the assessment of the Trade Representative with respect to the operation of the USMCA;

(B) the precise recommendation for action to be proposed at the review and the position of the United States with respect to whether to extend the term of the USMCA;

(C) what, if any, prior efforts have been made to resolve any concern that underlies that recommendation or position; and

(D) the views of the advisory committees established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding that recommendation or position.

(c) **SUBSEQUENT ACTION TO ADDRESS LACK OF AGREEMENT ON TERM EXTENSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If, as part of a joint review, any USMCA country does not confirm that the country wishes to extend the term of the USMCA under article 34.7.3 of the USMCA, at least 70 days before any subsequent annual joint review meeting conducted as required under article 34.7 of the USMCA, the Trade Representative shall report to the appropriate congressional committees regarding—

(A) any reason offered by a USMCA country regarding why the country is unable to agree to extend the term of the USMCA;

(B) the progress that has been made in efforts to achieve resolution of the concerns of that country;

(C) any proposed action that the Trade Representative intends to raise during the meeting; and

(D) the views of the advisory committees established under section 135 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155) regarding the reasons described in subparagraph (A) and any proposed action under subparagraph (C).

(2) **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.**—The Trade Representative shall also provide detailed and timely information in response to any questions posed by the appropriate congressional committees with respect to any meeting described in paragraph (1), including by submitting to those committees copies of any proposed text that the Trade Representative plans to submit to the other parties to the meeting.

(d) **CONGRESSIONAL ENGAGEMENT AFTER JOINT REVIEW.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 20 days after the USMCA countries have met for a joint review, the Trade Representative shall brief the appropriate congressional committees regarding the positions expressed by the countries during the joint review and what, if any, actions were agreed to by the countries.

(2) **CONTINUED ENGAGEMENT.**—After a joint review, the Trade Representative shall keep the appropriate congressional committees timely apprised of any developments arising out of or related to the review.

(e) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **JOINT REVIEW.**—The term “joint review” means a review conducted under the process provided for in article 34.7 of the USMCA relating to extension of the term of the USMCA.

(2) **USMCA COUNTRY.**—The term “USMCA country” has the meaning given that term in section 202(a).

Subtitle C—Termination of USMCA

SEC. 621. TERMINATION OF USMCA.

(a) **TERMINATION OF USMCA COUNTRY STATUS.**—During any period in which a country ceases to be a USMCA country, this Act (other than this subsection and title IX) and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to have effect with respect to that country.

(b) **TERMINATION OF USMCA.**—On the date on which the USMCA ceases to be in force with respect to the United States, this Act and the amendments made by this Act (other than this subsection and title IX) shall cease to have effect.

TITLE VII—LABOR MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 701. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **LABOR ATTACHÉ.**—The term “labor attaché” means an individual hired under subtitle B.

(2) **LABOR OBLIGATIONS.**—The term “labor obligations” means the obligations under chapter 23 of the USMCA (relating to labor).

(3) **MEXICO’S LABOR REFORM.**—The term “Mexico’s labor reform” means the legislation on labor reform enacted by Mexico on May 1, 2019.

Subtitle A—Interagency Labor Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement

SEC. 711. INTERAGENCY LABOR COMMITTEE FOR MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish an Interagency Labor Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement (in this title referred to as the

“Interagency Labor Committee”), to coordinate United States efforts with respect to each USMCA country—

(1) to monitor the implementation and maintenance of the labor obligations;

(2) to monitor the implementation and maintenance of Mexico’s labor reform; and

(3) to request enforcement actions with respect to a USMCA country that is not in compliance with such labor obligations.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Interagency Labor Committee shall—

(1) be co-chaired by the Trade Representative and the Secretary of Labor; and

(2) include representatives of such other Federal departments or agencies with relevant expertise as the President determines appropriate.

(c) **MEETINGS.**—The Interagency Labor Committee shall meet at least once every 90 days during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and at least once every 180 days thereafter for 5 years.

(d) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the members of the Interagency Labor Committee may exchange information for purposes of carrying out this title.

SEC. 712. DUTIES.

The duties of the Interagency Labor Committee shall include the following:

(1) Coordinating the activities of departments and agencies of the Committee in monitoring implementation of and compliance with labor obligations, including by—

(A) requesting and reviewing relevant information from the governments of USMCA countries and from the public;

(B) coordinating visits to Mexico as necessary to assess implementation of Mexico’s labor reform and compliance with the labor obligations of Mexico;

(C) receiving and reviewing quarterly assessments from the labor attachés with respect to the implementation of and compliance with Mexico’s labor reform; and

(D) coordinating with the Secretary of Treasury with respect to support relating to labor issues provided to Mexico by the Inter-American Development Bank.

(2) Establishing an ongoing dialogue with appropriate officials of the Government of Mexico regarding the implementation of Mexico’s labor reform and compliance with its labor obligations.

(3) Coordinating with other institutions and governments with respect to support relating to labor issues, such as the International Labour Organization and the Government of Canada.

(4) Identifying priority issues for capacity-building activities in Mexico to be funded by the United States, drawing primarily on the expertise of the Department of Labor.

(5) Meeting, at least biannually during the 5-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and at least annually for 5 years thereafter, with the Labor Advisory Committee for Trade Negotiations and Trade Policy established under section 135(c)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(c)(1)) (or any successor advisory committee) to consult and provide opportunities for input with respect to—

(A) the implementation of Mexico’s labor reform;

(B) labor capacity-building activities in Mexico funded by the United States;

(C) labor monitoring efforts;

(D) labor enforcement priorities; and

(E) other relevant issues.

(6) Based on the assessments required by section 714, making recommendations relating to dispute settlement actions to the Trade Representative, in accordance with section 715.

(7) Based on reports provided by the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force under section 743, developing recommendations for appropriate enforcement actions by the Trade Representative.

(8) Reviewing reports submitted by the labor experts appointed in accordance with Annex 31-A of the USMCA, with respect to the functioning of that Annex.

(9) Reviewing reports submitted by the Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board under section 734.

SEC. 713. ENFORCEMENT PRIORITIES.

The Interagency Labor Committee shall—

(1) review the list of priority sectors under Annex 31-A of the USMCA and suggest to USTR additional sectors for review by the USMCA countries as appropriate;

(2) establish and annually update a list of priority subsectors within such priority sectors to be the focus of the enforcement efforts of the Committee, the first of which shall consist of—

(A) auto assembly;

(B) auto parts;

(C) aerospace;

(D) industrial bakeries;

(E) electronics;

(F) call centers;

(G) mining; and

(H) steel and aluminum; and

(3) review priority facilities within such priority subsectors for monitoring and enforcement.

SEC. 714. ASSESSMENTS.

(a) **ONGOING ASSESSMENTS.**—For the 10-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, except as provided in subsection (b), the Interagency Labor Committee shall assess on a biannual basis the extent to which Mexico is in compliance with its obligations under Annex 23-A of the USMCA.

(b) **CONSULTATION RELATING TO ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.**—On or after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Interagency Labor Committee may consult with the appropriate congressional committees with respect to the frequency of the assessment required under subsection (a) and, with the approval of both such committees, may conduct such assessment on an annual basis for the following 5 years.

(c) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The assessment required under subsection (a) shall also include each of the following:

(1) Whether Mexico is providing adequate funding to implement and enforce Mexico’s labor reform, including specifically whether Mexico has provided funding consistent with commitments made to contribute the following amounts for the labor reform implementation budget:

(A) \$176,000,000 for 2021.

(B) \$325,000,000 for 2022.

(C) \$328,000,000 for 2023.

(2) The extent to which any legal challenges to Mexico’s labor reform have succeeded in that court system.

(3) The extent to which Mexico has implemented the federal and state labor courts, registration entity, and federal and state conciliation centers consistent with the timeline set forth for Mexico’s labor reform, in the September 2019 policy statements by the Government of Mexico on a national strategy for implementation of the labor justice system, and in subsequent policy statements in accordance with Mexico’s labor reform.

SEC. 715. RECOMMENDATION FOR ENFORCEMENT ACTION.

(a) **RECOMMENDATION TO INITIATE.**—If the Interagency Labor Committee determines, pursuant to an assessment under section 714, as a result of monitoring activities described in section 712(1), or pursuant to a report of

the Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board that a USMCA country has failed to meet its labor obligations, including with respect to obligations under Annex 23-A of the USMCA, the Committee shall recommend that the Trade Representative initiate enforcement actions under—

(1) article 23.13 or 23.17 of the USMCA (relating to cooperative labor dialogue and labor consultations);

(2) articles 31.4 and 31.6 of the USMCA (relating to dispute settlement consultations); or

(3) Annex 31-A of the USMCA (relating to the rapid response labor mechanism).

(b) **TRADE REPRESENTATIVE DETERMINATIONS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Trade Representative receives a recommendation pursuant to subsection (a), the Trade Representative shall—

(1) determine whether to initiate an enforcement action; and

(2) if such determination is negative, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the reasons for such negative determination.

SEC. 716. PETITION PROCESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Interagency Labor Committee shall establish procedures for submissions by the public of information with respect to potential failures to implement the labor obligations of a USMCA country.

(b) **FACILITY-SPECIFIC PETITIONS.**—With respect to information submitted in accordance with the procedures established under subsection (a) accompanying a petition relating to a denial of rights at a covered facility, as such terms are defined for purposes of Annex 31-A of the USMCA:

(1) The Interagency Labor Committee shall review such information within 30 days of submission and shall determine whether there is sufficient, credible evidence of a denial of rights (as so defined) enabling the good-faith invocation of enforcement mechanisms.

(2) If the Committee reaches a negative determination under paragraph (1), the Committee shall certify such determination to the appropriate congressional committees and the petitioner.

(3) If the Committee reaches an affirmative determination under paragraph (1), the Trade Representative shall submit a request for review, in accordance with article 31-A.4 of such Annex, with respect to the covered facility and shall inform the petitioner and the appropriate congressional committees of the submission of such request.

(4) Not later than 60 days after the date of an affirmative determination under paragraph (1), the Trade Representative shall—

(A) determine whether to request the establishment of a rapid response labor panel in accordance with such Annex; and

(B) if such determination is negative, certify such determination to the appropriate congressional committees in conjunction with the reasons for such determination and the details of any agreed-upon remediation plan.

(c) **OTHER PETITIONS.**—With respect to information submitted in accordance with the procedures established under subsection (a) accompanying a petition relating to any other violation of the labor obligations of a USMCA country:

(1) The Interagency Labor Committee shall review such information not later than 20 days after the date of the submission and shall determine whether the information warrants further review.

(2) If the Committee reaches an affirmative determination under paragraph (1), such further review shall focus exclusively on determining, not later than 60 days after the date

of such submission, whether there is sufficient, credible evidence that the USMCA country is in violation of its labor obligations, for purposes of initiating enforcement action under chapter 23 or chapter 31 of the USMCA.

(3) If the Committee reaches an affirmative determination under paragraph (2), the Trade Representative shall—

(A) not later than 60 days after the date of the determination of the Committee, initiate appropriate enforcement action under such chapter 23 or chapter 31; or

(B) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a notification including the reasons for which action was not initiated within such 60-day period.

SEC. 717. HOTLINE.

The Interagency Labor Committee shall establish a web-based hotline, monitored by the Department of Labor, to receive confidential information regarding labor issues among USMCA countries directly from interested parties, including Mexican workers.

SEC. 718. REPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter for 10 years except as provided in subsection (b), the Interagency Labor Committee shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes—

(1) a description of Committee staffing and capacity building activities with Mexico;

(2) information regarding the budget resources for Mexico's labor reform and the deadlines in the September 2019 policy statements by the Government of Mexico on a national strategy for implementation of the labor justice system and in subsequent policy statements in accordance with Mexico's labor reform;

(3) a summary of petitions filed in accordance with section 716 and the use of the rapid response labor mechanism under Annex 31-A of the USMCA;

(4) the results of the most recent assessment conducted under section 714; and

(5) if, with respect to any report of the Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board submitted under section 734 that includes a determination described in paragraph (2) of such section, the Interagency Labor Committee does not concur with such determination, an explanation of the reasons for not concurring in such determination and a commitment to provide an oral briefing with respect to such explanation upon request.

(b) **CONSULTATION RELATING TO ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.**—On or after the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Trade Representative and the Secretary of Labor may consult with the appropriate congressional committees with respect to the frequency of the reports required under subsection (a) and, with the approval of both such committees, may submit such report on an annual basis for the following 5 years.

(c) **FIVE-YEAR ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than the date that is 5 years after the date of the establishment of the Interagency Labor Committee pursuant to section 711(a), the Committee shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) a comprehensive assessment of the implementation of Mexico's labor reform, including with respect to—

(A) whether Mexico has reviewed and legitimized all existing collective bargaining agreements in Mexico;

(B) whether Mexico has addressed the pre-existing legal or administrative labor disputes;

(C) whether Mexico has established the Federal Center for Conciliation and Labor Registration, and an assessment of that Center's operation;

(D) whether Mexico has established the federal labor courts, and an assessment of their operation; and

(E) whether Mexico has established the state conciliation centers and labor courts in all states and an assessment of their operation; and

(2) a strategic plan and recommendations for actions to address areas of concern relating to the implementation of Mexico's labor reform, for purposes of the joint review conducted pursuant to article 34.7 of the USMCA on the sixth anniversary of the entry into force of the USMCA.

SEC. 719. CONSULTATIONS ON APPOINTMENT AND FUNDING OF RAPID RESPONSE LABOR PANELISTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Interagency Labor Committee shall consult with the Labor Advisory Committee established under section 135(c)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(c)(1)) and the Advisory Committee for Trade Policy and Negotiations established under section 135(b) of such Act (or successor advisory committees) and the appropriate congressional committees with respect to the selection and appointment of candidates for the rapid response labor panelists described in Annex 31-A of the USMCA.

(b) **FUNDING.**—The United States, in consultation with Mexico, shall provide adequate funding for rapid response labor panelists to carry out the responsibilities under the USMCA promptly and fully.

Subtitle B—Mexico Labor Attachés

SEC. 721. ESTABLISHMENT.

The Secretary of Labor shall—

(1) hire and fix the compensation of up to 5 additional full-time officers or employees of the Department of Labor; and

(2) detail or assign such officers or employees to the United States Embassy or a United States Consulate in Mexico to carry out the duties described in section 722.

SEC. 722. DUTIES.

The duties described in this section are the following:

(1) Assisting the Interagency Labor Committee to monitor and enforce the labor obligations of Mexico.

(2) Submitting to the Interagency Labor Committee on a quarterly basis reports on the efforts undertaken by Mexico to comply with its labor obligations.

SEC. 723. STATUS.

Any officer or employee, while detailed or assigned under this subtitle, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving their allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the agency of the United States Government from which detailed or assigned, and shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from program funds appropriated to that agency or made available to that agency for purposes related to the activities of the detail or assignment, in accordance with authorities related to their employment status and agency policies.

Subtitle C—Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board

SEC. 731. ESTABLISHMENT.

There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Independent Mexico Labor Expert Board", to be responsible for monitoring and evaluating the implementation of Mexico's labor reform and compliance with its labor obligations. The Board shall also advise the Interagency Labor Committee with respect to capacity-building activities needed to support such implementation and compliance.

SEC. 732. MEMBERSHIP; TERM.

(a) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Board shall be composed of 12 members who shall be appointed as follows:

(1) Four members to be appointed by the Labor Advisory Committee established under section 135(c)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(c)(1)) (or successor advisory committee).

(2) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(3) Two members appointed by the president pro tempore of the Senate from among individuals recommended by the majority leader of the Senate and in consultation with the Chair of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(4) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(5) Two members appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate from among individuals recommended by the minority leader of the Senate and in consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(b) **TERM.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), members of the Board shall serve for a term of 6 years.

(c) **EXTENSION OF TERM.**—If the Board determines, at the end of the 6-year period beginning on the date of the appointment of the last member appointed in accordance with subsection (a), that Mexico is not fully in compliance with its labor obligations, a majority of the members of the Board may determine to extend its term for 4 additional years. A new Board shall be appointed in accordance with subsection (a) and shall serve for a single term of 4 years.

SEC. 733. FUNDING.

The United States shall provide necessary funding to support the work of the Board, including with respect to translation services and personnel support.

SEC. 734. REPORTS.

For the 6-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and for an additional 4 years if the term of the Board is extended in accordance with section 732(c), the Board shall submit to appropriate congressional committees and to the Interagency Labor Committee an annual report that—

- (1) contains an assessment of—
 - (A) the efforts of Mexico to implement Mexico's labor reform; and
 - (B) the manner and extent to which labor laws are generally enforced in Mexico; and
- (2) may include a determination that Mexico is not in compliance with its labor obligations.

Subtitle D—Forced Labor

SEC. 741. FORCED LABOR ENFORCEMENT TASK FORCE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish a Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force to monitor United States enforcement of the prohibition under section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

(b) **MEMBERS; MEETINGS.**—

(1) **MEMBERS.**—The Task Force shall be chaired by the Secretary of Homeland Security and shall be comprised of representatives from such other agencies with relevant expertise, including the Office of the United States Trade Representative and the Department of Labor, as the President determines appropriate.

(2) **MEETINGS.**—The Task Force shall meet on a quarterly basis regarding active Withhold and Release Orders, ongoing investigations, petitions received, and enforcement priorities, and other relevant issues with respect to enforcing the prohibition under section 307 of the Tariff Act.

SEC. 742. TIMELINE REQUIRED.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the establishment of the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force pursuant to section 741(a), the Task Force shall establish timelines for responding to petitions submitted to the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection alleging that goods are being imported by or with child or forced labor.

(b) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—In establishing the timelines during such 90-day period, the Task Force shall consult with the appropriate congressional committees.

(c) **REPORT.**—The Task Force shall timely submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that contains the timelines established pursuant to subsection (a) and shall make such report publicly available.

SEC. 743. REPORTS REQUIRED.

The Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force shall submit to appropriate congressional committees a biannual report that includes the following:

(1) The enforcement activities and priorities of the Department of Homeland Security with respect to enforcing the prohibition under section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

(2) The number of instances in which merchandise was denied entry pursuant to such prohibition during the preceding 180-day period.

(3) A description of the merchandise so denied entry.

(4) An enforcement plan regarding goods included in the most recent “Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor” report submitted in accordance with section 504 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2464) and “List of Goods Produced by Child Labor or Forced Labor” submitted in accordance with section 105(b)(2)(C) of the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005 (22 U.S.C. 7112(b)(2)(C)).

(5) Such other information as the Forced Labor Enforcement Task Force considers appropriate with respect to monitoring and enforcing compliance with section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

SEC. 744. DUTIES RELATED TO MEXICO.

The Task Force shall—

- (1) develop, in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees, an enforcement plan regarding goods produced by or with forced labor in Mexico; and
- (2) report to the Interagency Labor Committee with respect to any concerns relating to the enforcement of the prohibition under section 307 of the Tariff Act with respect to Mexico, including any allegations that may be filed with respect to forced labor in Mexico.

Subtitle E—Enforcement Under Rapid Response Labor Mechanism

SEC. 751. TRANSMISSION OF REPORTS.

Each report issued by a rapid response labor panel constituted in accordance with Annex 31-A of the USMCA shall be immediately submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, the Labor Advisory Committee established under section 135(c)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(c)(1)) (or successor advisory committee), and, as appropriate, the petitioner submitting information pursuant to section 716. The Trade Representative shall also make each such report publicly available in a timely manner.

SEC. 752. SUSPENSION OF LIQUIDATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If the United States files a request pursuant to article 31-A.4.2 of Annex 31-A of the USMCA, the Trade Representative may direct the Secretary of the Treasury to suspend liquidation for unliqui-

dated entries of goods from such covered facility until such time as the Trade Representative notifies the Secretary that a condition described in subsection (b) has been met.

(b) **RESUMPTION OF LIQUIDATION.**—The conditions described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The rapid response labor panel has determined that there is no denial of rights at the covered facility within the meaning of such terms under Annex 31-A of the USMCA.

(2) A course of remediation for denial of rights has been agreed to and has been completed in accordance with the agreed-upon time.

(3) The denial of rights has been otherwise remedied.

SEC. 753. FINAL REMEDIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—If a rapid response labor panel constituted in accordance with Annex 31-A of the USMCA determines with respect to a case that there has been a denial of rights within the meaning of such Annex, the Trade Representative may, in consultation with the appropriate congressional committees—

(1) direct the Secretary of the Treasury, until the date of the notification described in subsection (b) and in accordance with Annex 31-A of the USMCA—

(A) to—

(i) deny entry to goods, produced wholly or in part, from any covered facility involved in such case; or

(ii) allow for the release of goods, produced wholly or in part, from such covered facilities only upon payment of duties and any penalty; and

(B) to apply any duties or penalties to customs entries for which liquidation was suspended pursuant to section 752; and

(2) apply other remedies that are appropriate and available under Annex 31-A of the USMCA, until the denial of rights with respect to the case has been remedied.

(b) **REMEDIATION NOTIFICATION.**—The Trade Representative shall promptly notify the Secretary when the denial of rights with respect to a case described in subsection (a) has been remedied.

TITLE VIII—ENVIRONMENT MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 801. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **ENVIRONMENTAL LAW.**—The term “environmental law” has the meaning given the term in article 24.1 of the USMCA.

(2) **ENVIRONMENTAL OBLIGATIONS.**—The term “environmental obligations” means obligations relating to the environment under—

(A) chapter 1 of the USMCA (relating to initial provisions and general definitions); and

(B) chapter 24 of the USMCA (relating to environment).

Subtitle A—Interagency Environment Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement

SEC. 811. ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall establish an Interagency Environment Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement (in this title referred to as the “Interagency Environment Committee”)—

(1) to coordinate United States efforts to monitor and enforce environmental obligations generally; and

(2) with respect to the USMCA countries—

(A) to carry out an assessment of their environmental laws and policies;

(B) to carry out monitoring actions with respect to the implementation and maintenance of their environmental obligations; and

(C) to request enforcement actions with respect to USMCA countries that are not in compliance with their environmental obligations.

(b) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The members of the Interagency Environment Committee shall be the following:

(1) The Trade Representative, who shall serve as chairperson.

(2) Representatives from each of the following:

(A) The National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration.

(B) The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

(C) The U.S. Forest Service.

(D) The Environmental Protection Agency.

(E) The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.

(F) U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

(G) The Department of State.

(H) The Department of Justice.

(I) The Department of the Treasury.

(J) The United States Agency for International Development.

(3) Representatives from other Federal agencies, as the President determines to be appropriate.

(c) **INFORMATION SHARING.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the members of the Interagency Environment Committee may exchange information for purposes of carrying out this subtitle.

SEC. 812. ASSESSMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Interagency Environment Committee shall carry out an assessment of the environmental laws and policies of the USMCA countries—

(1) to determine if such laws and policies are sufficient to implement their environmental obligations; and

(2) to identify any gaps between such laws and policies and their environmental obligations.

(b) **MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.**—The assessment required by subsection (a) shall identify the environmental laws and policies of the USMCA countries with respect to which enhanced cooperation, including the provision of technical assistance and capacity building assistance, monitoring actions, and enforcement actions, if appropriate, should be carried out on an enhanced and continuing basis.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date on which the Interagency Environment Committee is established, or the date on which the USMCA enters into force, whichever occurs earlier, the Interagency Environment Committee shall submit a report that contains the assessment required by subsection (a) to—

(1) the appropriate congressional committees; and

(2) the Trade and Environment Policy Advisory Committee (or successor advisory committee) established under section 135(c)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(c)(1)).

(d) **UPDATE.**—The Interagency Environment Committee shall—

(1) update the assessment required by subsection (a) at the appropriate time prior to submission of the report required by section 816(a) that is to be submitted in the fifth year after the USMCA enters into force; and

(2) submit the updated assessment to the Trade Representative for inclusion in such fifth annual report.

(e) **CONSULTATION.**—The Interagency Environment Committee shall consult on a regular basis with the USMCA countries—

(1) in carrying out the assessment required by subsection (a) and the update to the assessment required by subsection (d); and

(2) in preparing the report required by subsection (c).

SEC. 813. MONITORING ACTIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Interagency Environment Committee shall carry out monitoring

actions, which shall include the monitoring actions described in subsections (b), (c), and (d), with respect to the implementation and maintenance of the environmental obligations of the USMCA countries.

(b) **REVIEW OF CEC SECRETARIAT SUBMISSIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Secretariat of the Commission for Environmental Cooperation prepares a factual record under article 24.28 of the USMCA relating to a submission filed under article 24.27 of the USMCA with respect to a USMCA country, the Interagency Environment Committee—

(A) shall review the factual record; and

(B) may, based on findings of the review under subparagraph (A) that the USMCA country is not in compliance with its environmental obligations, request enforcement actions under section 814 with respect to the USMCA country.

(2) **WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.**—If the Interagency Environment Committee finds that a USMCA country is not in compliance with its environmental obligations under paragraph (1)(B) and determines not to request enforcement actions under section 814 with respect to the USMCA country, the Committee shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which it makes the determination, provide to the appropriate congressional committees a written explanation and justification of the determination.

(c) **REVIEW OF REPORTS OF UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENT ATTACHÉS TO MEXICO.**—The Interagency Environment Committee shall—

(1) review each report submitted to the Committee under section 822(b)(2); and

(2) based on the findings of each such report, assess the efforts of Mexico to comply with its environmental obligations.

(d) **UNITED STATES IMPLEMENTATION OF ENVIRONMENT COOPERATION AND CUSTOMS VERIFICATION AGREEMENT.**—

(1) **VERIFICATION OF SHIPMENTS.**—The Interagency Environment Committee—

(A) may request verification of particular shipments of Mexico under the Environment Cooperation and Customs Verification Agreement between the United States and Mexico, done at Mexico City on December 10, 2019, in response to—

(i) comments submitted by the public to request verification of particular shipments of Mexico under such Agreement; or

(ii) on its own motion; and

(B) upon receipt of comments described in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) shall review the comments not later than 30 days after the date on which the comments are submitted to the Trade Representative; and

(ii) may request the Trade Representative to, within a reasonable period of time, request Mexico to provide relevant information for purposes of verification of particular shipments of Mexico described in subparagraph (A).

(2) **REVIEW OF RELEVANT INFORMATION AND REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL STEPS.**—The Interagency Environment Committee—

(A) shall review relevant information provided by Mexico as described in paragraph (1)(B)(ii) to determine if the Trade Representative should request additional steps to verify information provided or related to a particular shipment of Mexico; and

(B) may request the Trade Representative to, within a reasonable period of time, request Mexico to take such additional steps with respect to the particular shipment.

(3) **CONSULTATION.**—The Trade Representative, on behalf of the Interagency Environment Committee, shall, on a quarterly basis, consult with the appropriate congressional committees and the Trade and Environment Policy Advisory Committee (or successor ad-

visory committee) established under section 135(c)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2155(c)(1)) regarding the public comments and relevant information described in paragraph (1) and the actions taken under paragraph (2).

(e) **APPLICATION.**—Subsections (c) and (d) shall apply with respect to Mexico for such time as the USMCA is in force with respect to, and the United States applies the USMCA to, Mexico.

SEC. 814. ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

The Interagency Environment Committee—

(1) may request the Trade Representative to, within a reasonable period of time, request consultations under—

(A) article 24.29 of the USMCA (relating to environment consultations) with respect to the USMCA country; or

(B) articles 31.4 and 31.6 of the USMCA (relating to dispute settlement consultations) with respect to the USMCA country; or

(2) may request the heads of other Federal agencies described in section 815 to initiate monitoring or enforcement actions with respect to the USMCA country under the provisions of law described in section 815.

SEC. 815. OTHER MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

(a) **MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT.**—The Secretary of Commerce has authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361 et seq.).

(b) **MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT.**—The Secretary of Commerce has authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the following provisions of law:

(1) The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.).

(2) The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Reauthorization Act of 2006 (16 U.S.C. 1891 et seq.).

(3) The High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1826d et seq.).

(4) The Shark Conservation Act of 2010 (16 U.S.C. 1826k note; 1857 note).

(5) The Shark Finning Prohibition Act (16 U.S.C. 1822 note).

(c) **FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.**—The Secretary of Commerce and Secretary of the Interior have authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under section 8 of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1978).

(d) **AGREEMENT ON PORT STATE MEASURES TO PREVENT, DETER AND ELIMINATE ILLEGAL, UNREPORTED AND UNREGULATED FISHING.**—The Secretary of Commerce has authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Port State Measures Agreement Act of 2015 (16 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.).

(e) **ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.**—The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of the Treasury have authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(f) **LACEY ACT.**—The Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Secretary of the Treasury have authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.).

(g) **MIGRATORY BIRD TREATY ACT.**—The Secretary of the Interior has authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.).

(h) **ELIMINATE, NEUTRALIZE, AND DISRUPT WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING ACT.**—The Secretary

of State, the Secretary of the Interior, the Attorney General, and Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development have authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Eliminate, Neutralize, and Disrupt Wildlife Trafficking Act of 2016 (16 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.).

(i) **WILD BIRD CONSERVATION ACT.**—The Secretary of the Interior has authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under the Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.).

(j) **CUSTOMS SEIZURE AND OTHER AUTHORITIES.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security has authority to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under section 499 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1499) or section 596 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1595a).

(k) **OTHER RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF LAW.**—The Interagency Environment Committee may request the heads of other Federal agencies to take appropriate monitoring or enforcement actions under other relevant provisions of law.

(l) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to supersede or otherwise limit in any manner the functions or authority of the head of any Federal agency described in this section under any other provision of law.

SEC. 816. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Trade Representative, in consultation with the head of any Federal agency described in this subtitle, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the implementation of this subtitle, including—

(1) a description of efforts of the USMCA countries to implement their environmental obligations; and

(2) a description of additional efforts to be taken with respect to USMCA countries that are failing to implement their environmental obligations.

(b) **TIMING OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted—

(1) not later than one year after the date on which the USMCA enters into force;

(2) annually for each of the next four years; and

(3) biennially thereafter.

(c) **ADDITIONAL MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) that is submitted in the fifth year after the USMCA enters into force shall also include the following:

(1) The updated assessment required by section 812(d).

(2) A comprehensive determination regarding USMCA countries' implementation of their environmental obligations.

(3) An explanation of how compliance with environmental obligations will be taken into consideration during the "joint review" conducted pursuant to article 34.7.2 of the USMCA on the sixth anniversary of the entry into force of the USMCA.

SEC. 817. REGULATIONS.

The head of any Federal agency described in this subtitle, in consultation with the Interagency Environment Committee, may prescribe such regulations as are necessary to carry out the authorities of the Federal agency as provided for under this subtitle.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 821. BORDER WATER INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AUTHORITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall, in coordination with eligible public entities, carry out the planning, design, construction, and operation and maintenance of high priority treatment works in the covered area to treat wastewater (including stormwater), nonpoint sources of pollution, and related matters resulting from international transboundary water flows originating in Mexico.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on activities carried out pursuant to this section.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **COVERED AREA.**—The term "covered area" means the portion of the Tijuana River watershed that is in the United States.

(2) **ELIGIBLE PUBLIC ENTITIES.**—The term "eligible public entities" means—

(A) the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission;

(B) the Corps of Engineers;

(C) the North American Development Bank;

(D) the Department of State;

(E) any other appropriate Federal agency;

(F) the State of California; and

(G) any of the following entities with jurisdiction over any part of the covered area:

(i) A local government.

(ii) An Indian Tribe.

(iii) A regional water board.

(iv) A public wastewater utility.

(3) **TREATMENT WORKS.**—The term "treatment works" has the meaning given that term in section 212 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

SEC. 822. DETAIL OF PERSONNEL TO OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Upon the request of the Trade Representative, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Administrator of the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration may detail, on a reimbursable basis, one employee of each such respective agency to the Office of the United States Trade Representative to be assigned to the United States Embassy in Mexico to carry out the duties described in subsection (b).

(b) **DUTIES.**—The duties described in this subsection are the following:

(1) Assist the Interagency Environment Committee to carry out monitoring and enforcement actions with respect to the environmental obligations of Mexico.

(2) Prepare and submit to the Interagency Environment Committee on a quarterly basis a report on efforts of Mexico to comply with its environmental obligations.

Subtitle C—North American Development Bank

SEC. 831. GENERAL CAPITAL INCREASE.

Part 2 of subtitle D of title V of Public Law 103-182 (22 U.S.C. 290m et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 547. FIRST CAPITAL INCREASE.

"(a) **SUBSCRIPTION AUTHORIZED.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to subscribe on behalf of the United States to, and make payment for, 150,000 additional shares of the capital stock of the Bank.

"(2) **LIMITATION.**—Any subscription by the United States to the capital stock of the Bank shall be effective only to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in advance in appropriations Acts.

"(b) **LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to pay for the increase in the United States subscription to the Bank under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, \$1,500,000,000 for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(2) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—Of the amount authorized to be appropriated under paragraph (1)—

"(A) \$225,000,000 shall be for paid in shares of the Bank; and

"(B) \$1,275,000,000 shall be for callable shares of the Bank."

SEC. 832. POLICY GOALS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—To the extent consistent with the mission and scope of the North American Development Bank on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act and pursuant to section 2 of article II of the Charter, the Secretary of the Treasury should direct the representatives of the United States to the Board of Directors of the Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to give preference to the financing of projects related to environmental infrastructure relating to water pollution, wastewater treatment, water conservation, municipal solid waste, stormwater drainage, non-point pollution, and related matters.

(b) **CHARTER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "Charter" means the Agreement Concerning the Establishment of a Border Environment Cooperation Commission and a North American Development Bank, signed at Washington and Mexico November 16 and 18, 1993, and entered into force January 1, 1994 (TIAS 12516), between the United States and Mexico.

SEC. 833. EFFICIENCIES AND STREAMLINING.

The Secretary of the Treasury should direct the representatives of the United States to the Board of Directors of the North American Development Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to seek to require the Bank to develop and implement efficiency improvements to streamline and accelerate the project certification and financing process, including through initiatives such as single certifications for revolving facilities, programmatic certification of similar groups of small projects, expansion of internal authority to approve qualified projects below certain monetary thresholds, and expedited certification for public sector projects subject to lender bidding processes.

SEC. 834. PERFORMANCE MEASURES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Treasury should direct the representatives of the United States to the Board of Directors of the North American Development Bank to use the voice and vote of the United States to seek to require the Bank to develop performance measures that—

(1) demonstrate how projects and financing approved by the Bank are meeting the Bank's mission and providing added value to the region near the international land border between the United States and Mexico; and

(2) are reviewed and updated not less frequently than annually.

(b) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to Congress, with the submission to Congress of the budget of the President for a fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, a report on progress in imposing the performance measures described in subsection (a) of this section.

TITLE IX—USMCA SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for fiscal year 2020 and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and Expenses", for enforcement of the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.) during fiscal years 2020 through 2023 related to trade activities between the United States and Mexico, \$4,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement

pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC
ADMINISTRATION
OPERATIONS, RESEARCH, AND FACILITIES

For an additional amount for “Operations, Research, and Facilities”, \$16,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That \$8,000,000 shall be available to engage in cooperation with the Government of Mexico to combat illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing and enhance the implementation of the Seafood Import Monitoring Program pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1826 and 1829, during fiscal years 2020 through 2023: *Provided further*, That \$8,000,000 shall be available to carry out section 3 of the Marine Debris Act (33 U.S.C. 1952) during fiscal years 2020 through 2023 in the North American region: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE
REPRESENTATIVE
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$50,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That \$30,000,000 shall be available solely to provide for additional capacity of the Office during fiscal years 2020 through 2023 to monitor compliance with labor obligations (as such term is defined in section 701 of this Act), including the necessary expenses of additional full-time employees to participate in the Interagency Labor Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement established pursuant to section 711 of this Act: *Provided further*, That \$20,000,000 shall be available to reimburse the necessary expenses of personnel participating in the Interagency Environment Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement established pursuant to section 811 of this Act during fiscal years 2020 through 2023 to monitor compliance with environmental obligations (as such term is defined in section 801 of this Act), including up to 1 additional full-time employee detailed to the United States Embassy in Mexico from each of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration: *Provided further*, That, if the United States Trade Representative determines that the additional amount appropriated under this heading in this Act exceeds the amount sufficient to provide for the reimbursement of personnel specified in the previous proviso, such excess amounts may be used to reimburse the necessary expenses of additional personnel participating in the Interagency Environment Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement during fiscal years 2020 through 2023 to monitor compliance with environmental obligations (as such term is defined in section 801 of this Act): *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

TRADE ENFORCEMENT TRUST FUND

For an additional amount for the “Trade Enforcement Trust Fund”, \$40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, to carry out the enforcement of environmental obligations under the USMCA, including for state-to-state dispute settlement actions, during fiscal years 2020 through 2023: *Provided*, That, amounts appropriated in this

paragraph shall not count toward the limitation specified in section 611(b)(2) of the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4405): *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for “Resource Management”, to enforce the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.) and sections 42 and 43 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to goods imported or exported between the United States and Mexico, during fiscal years 2020 through 2023, \$4,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for “Environmental Programs and Management” for necessary expenses for carrying out the Environmental Protection Agency’s efforts through the Commission for Environmental Cooperation during fiscal years 2020 through 2023, to reduce pollution, strengthen environmental governance, conserve biological diversity, and sustainably manage natural resources, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For an additional amount for “State and Tribal Assistance Grants” for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission, \$300,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$210,000,000, for the Bureau of International Labor Affairs to administer or operate international labor activities, bilateral and multilateral technical assistance, and microfinance programs, by or through contracts, grants, subgrants and other arrangements; of which \$180,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2023, shall be used to support reforms of the labor justice system in Mexico, including grants to support worker-focused capacity building, efforts to reduce workplace discrimination in Mexico, efforts to reduce child labor and forced labor in Mexico, efforts to reduce human trafficking, efforts to reduce child exploitation, and other efforts related to implementation of the USMCA; and of which \$30,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2027, shall be available to provide for additional capacity of the Bureau of International Labor Affairs during fiscal years 2020 through 2027 to monitor compliance with labor obligations (as such term is

defined in section 701 of this Act), including the necessary expenses of additional full-time employees of the Bureau to participate in the Interagency Labor Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement established pursuant to section 711 of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Labor may detail or assign up to 5 additional full-time employees of the Bureau to the United States Embassy or consulates in Mexico to (1) assist in monitoring and enforcement actions with respect to the labor obligations of Mexico, and (2) prepare a report, to be submitted on a quarterly basis to the Interagency Labor Committee for Monitoring and Enforcement through September 30, 2027, on the efforts of Mexico to comply with labor obligations (as such term is defined in section 701 of this Act): *Provided further*, That such employees, while detailed or assigned, shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds made available to the Bureau for purposes related to the activities of the detail or assignment, in accordance with authorities related to their employment status and agency policies: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE
INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
CONTRIBUTION TO THE NORTH AMERICAN
DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the North American Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increase in capital stock, \$215,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the authorities and conditions applicable to accounts in title V of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2019 (division F of Public Law 116-6) shall apply to the amounts provided under this heading: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS TITLE

SEC. 901. Each amount appropriated or made available by this title is in addition to any amounts otherwise appropriated for any of the fiscal years involved.

SEC. 902. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 903. Unless otherwise provided for by this title, the additional amounts appropriated by this title to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2020.

SEC. 904. Each amount designated in this title by the Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be available (or rescinded or transferred, if applicable) only if the President subsequently so designates all such amounts and transmits such designations to the Congress.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS

SEC. 905. (a) STATUTORY PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(b) SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.—The budgetary effects of this title shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

(c) CLASSIFICATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—Notwithstanding Rule 3 of the Budget Scorekeeping Guidelines set forth in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference accompanying Conference Report 105-217 and section 250(c)(7) and (c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the budgetary effects of this title shall be estimated for purposes of section 251 of such Act.

This title may be cited as the “USMCA Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2019”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 5430.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

This vote today, Madam Speaker, is a reminder that, even while the House was working on a serious matter regarding the President's accountability for abuses of office, we were still working hard to deliver on our promises to the American people to focus on economic opportunity, and in this instance we were working together.

This USMCA agreement before us is a vast improvement over the first version shown to us by President Trump and his team. We worked together, and it now includes critically important changes offered by Democratic members in order to ensure that its enforcement mechanisms are stronger, that it protects American workers, and that it will help lower prescription drug costs and improve access to medications.

This agreement, Madam Speaker, will also remove some of the uncertainty created by the tariff policies that have been pursued by the President.

I am glad that our House Democratic working group was able to secure new provisions to ensure that America's trading partners uphold the rights of workers to unionize and bargain collectively. And I am glad that this agreement includes strong, rapid-response enforcement mechanisms that will allow us to block imports produced in facilities where these commitments are violated.

I, and this Congress, will be closely monitoring the enforcement of this new agreement to make certain that the administration is doing its job and workers' rights are protected.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NEAL of the Ways and Means Com-

mittee, and Ambassador Lighthizer, who represented the administration in his straightforward, honest way. Their hard work and negotiations with the White House to improve on the administration's initial draft were successful.

I thank, as well, the members of the Democratic working group who spent months working alongside the Speaker and chairman to fight for the provisions necessary to secure House support.

This agreement, Madam Speaker, is truly the product of bipartisanship with many victories for Democrats, of which all Americans can be proud, and obviously, victories for Republicans, as well. I hope we can approve it today with a strong, bipartisan vote of support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Madam Speaker, in sharp contrast to yesterday, today is the first time this Chamber can finally rally behind an overwhelming, bipartisan legislative win since the beginning of this Congress.

More than a year ago, President Trump came together with the leaders of Mexico and Canada to sign a transformative trade deal that would revamp how we trade goods with our top two leading traders. Despite delay after delay from our Democratic colleagues, Republicans never relented.

We understood months ago that the United States-Mexico-Canada agreement would deliver a much-deserved win for the American worker. Today is for them. It is for our hardworking farmers who have early mornings and long days maintaining their harvest and livestock. It is for our consumers who will be paying less money at the checkout for everyday goods. It is for generations of Americans that will be able to enjoy a more prosperous and financially secure future for decades to come.

And because of that Republicans fought. We spoke to our constituents. We took to the floor to deliver speeches. I just did a report to see the number of times in the last year USMCA was mentioned on this floor. Ninety-one percent of all the times it was mentioned were from this side of the aisle and 9 percent on the other. I want to congratulate our members for never giving up.

We spoke about the wins the USMCA would deliver any chance we got, and we stayed in close contact with the administration to ensure that it would be the right deal worthy of the American workers' legacy.

Republicans also understood that the ratification of USMCA would only make the United States stronger as we continue to negotiate a trade with China.

I am glad today is here, but it is a year late. Mexico is our number one trader. Canada is our number two. China is number three. For the last

year we have been trying to negotiate an agreement with China. Our hand would only have been stronger if today happened months ago. I am glad today is here, but the delay has hurt us.

As we move forward, another goal that President Trump continues to make progress on is our negotiations with China. Today will make him stronger and, hopefully, help his hand from the last year.

Our economy is booming, exceeding expectations on a regular basis. Thanks to this President and Republicans in Congress pushing pro-growth policies, we are living through the best economy in a generation.

Regardless, if you are a Republican or a Democrat, the strength of this economy is undeniable, and that is a fact worth celebrating.

□ 1045

The ratification of the USMCA will guarantee that the trajectory continues to move in the same positive direction.

After 25 years, a revised trade agreement was well past due.

I know other Presidents had promised they would be able to do this. It is no small feat and not easy by any means, but it is another promise kept by this President, and we want to thank him for his work.

When President Trump ran for office, passing the USMCA was a campaign promise. Critics said it couldn't be done, yet he made it happen. Another promise made, another promise kept.

I also want to commend the incredible support he had from Congressional Republicans, especially our Ranking Member KEVIN BRADY and the entire team he has on the Ways and Means Committee. They never faltered, they never backed down, and they continued to work.

Madam Speaker, they never let the Democrat pushback hold them back from delivering a major win for the American worker.

Today is a day worth celebrating. It is a day this House, after nearly a year, finally checked their partisanship at the door to better the lives of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to stand in support of H.R. 5430, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.

The legislation we are considering today is the result of almost 14 months of negotiations between House Democrats and Ambassador Lighthizer, and I am very proud of the outcome that we have reached.

As a result of these months of work, the USMCA is a transformative agreement that creates a new high-water mark for U.S. trade deals going forward.

When we assumed the majority this year, we were asked to consider a renegotiated NAFTA that had structural flaws in a key number of areas: enforcement, labor rights, environment, and access to medicines.

Let me start with enforcement, which was the crux of this agreement.

As I have noted many times over the past year, I did not vote for the original NAFTA. The chief reason was the lack of enforceability mechanisms. During these past 25 years, we have seen the shortcomings of the original agreement, much of which comes down to a lack of enforcement, in my view.

House Democrats, working with Ambassador Lighthizer, fixed many of those issues. The improvements to the USMCA that we negotiated finally make the agreement enforceable by preventing a country from being able to block the formation of a dispute settlement panel.

On labor, our trade agreements, in many cases, have failed American workers. NAFTA has been symbolic of our broken promises to these workers.

Over 25 years of the NAFTA, there have been 39 petitions filed documenting the exploitation of workers and zero enforcement actions taken to remedy those violations.

In close partnership with labor unions and with the robust support of Ways and Means Democrats, support from Republicans, we negotiated improvements to the rules and to our monitoring regime, and we established a new enforcement mechanism.

On the rules, we strengthened certain provisions and addressed obstacles to enforcement in many others. On monitoring, for the first time we have created a proactive monitoring regime for labor obligations in a trade agreement. The implementing bill establishes an Interagency Labor Committee that will actively monitor Mexico's compliance, and report back to Congress.

On enforcement, we negotiated a historic mechanism never included in a trade agreement before. As a result of Democratic efforts, we will now have a facility-specific, rapid-response mechanism to address violations of key labor obligations.

We have made great improvements to environmental provisions. The USMCA will now include the highest environmental standards of any trade agreement in history and will include a new customs verification agreement to enhance enforcement.

The implementing bill, and I hope our colleagues in this Chamber will hear this, also secures more than \$600 million in funding for environmental problems in the NAFTA region and reauthorizes the North American Development Bank.

Through the dedication of the working group members, the Trade Subcommittee members, we also secured important changes to USMCA that preserve Congress' ability to change U.S. law to address the crisis we face with respect to high prescription drug prices.

These changes set a new standard for U.S. trade agreements, and demonstrate that trade agreements can achieve broad, bipartisan support if they empower workers, protect patients, provide access to affordable healthcare, and improve our shared environment.

I am proud of what we did here. After 14 months of negotiating on every conceivable front, we have improved the old NAFTA.

Madam Speaker, I want to remind our colleagues today, if they decide that they are not going to vote for this piece of legislation in front of us, that is up to them. But one thing they cannot say is, this is not much better than what we have had in the past.

So the options here are clear: you can vote for what we have negotiated or you can embrace the status quo. And if this fails today, that is precisely what you are doing: embracing the status quo.

This agreement, based upon the painstaking efforts of members of the committee and Ambassador Lighthizer, was done with full transparency. No surprises are in this legislation.

I hope that today we can say at the end of the time limits that this was a successful negotiation of the largest trade agreement in American history, a hemispheric agreement that I think we can stand in support of with great pride today.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, with impeachment, was a low mark in partisanship.

Today, we have the opportunity to set a high mark in consensus and bipartisanship.

Today is a momentous day. We will finally consider the implementing bill that brings the trade relationship between the U.S., Canada, and Mexico into the 21st century.

This trade agreement is sorely needed. It has been over 25 years since we first established this trade relationship through NAFTA. So much has changed since then.

For one thing, when we passed NAFTA, the phone booths by the Ways and Means hearing room actually had pay phones in them.

A new 21st century trade agreement will be a force multiplier for America's already strong economy.

Today marks the day 2 years ago that the House approved the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act for the first time that has transformed America's economy.

Today, President Trump and Ambassador Lighthizer have fought hard and delivered on their promise for a pro-growth and moderate trade pact. And because of their outstanding leadership and working closely with our congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle, we now have a trade agreement that will deliver historic wins for the economy, and that is because this trade agreement is all about growth.

USMCA will set the stage for billions more in economic activity. It creates, for the first time, rules for competing in the digital economy, to the advantage of America's manufacturers and farmers across so many sectors. It pries open Canada's market for U.S. farmers and ranchers to sell American dairy, wheat, chickens, eggs, and turkey. It improves the competitive position of our manufacturers, our service companies, and our small businesses. It ends the race to the bottom created by what had been Mexico's poor labor laws.

The agreement, best of all, is enforceable, allowing us to challenge violations and to stop countries from blocking these challenges, holding Mexico and Canada accountable for these new rules.

More jobs. More American customers.

America's innovators will get the tools they need to succeed here as we compete with countries like China.

Independent experts predict this new agreement will spur over \$68 billion in new economic activity.

We are always looking to create more U.S. jobs, and this will create more than 176,000 jobs here in America, including 76,000 in our auto sector. That is good news for everyone.

Best of all for the American people, USMCA is a truly bipartisan agreement.

To Chairman NEAL's credit and his remarkable hard work, House Democrats, including Chairman BLUMENAUER and my Texas colleague, HENRY CUELLAR and many others, worked in good faith with Ranking Member BUCHANAN and Ambassador Lighthizer to get on a path to "yes."

We are so glad to see so many Republican priorities were retained.

In the agreement before us today, we have labor and environmental rules that are realistic, they are measurable, they are enforceable.

What is not in this agreement are provisions for which there is no consensus, like the Paris climate accord.

It is not a perfect agreement. No trade agreements are. We will continue to work to improve the areas that we think can be improved in future agreements, but in any event, American workers have a major victory in the USMCA, and I am proud to support it.

It is a shame that the Speaker held it up for so long. It has been over a year since President Trump and our North American neighbors signed the new U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. It has been over half a year since Mexico ratified the initial agreement, and they have undertaken transformational labor reform.

Due to Democrats' misguided obsession with impeachment, they neglected moving forward on this pro-worker and pro-growth trade agreement for far too long.

Nonetheless, today I am so encouraged that we are here, finally moving forward on this new, strengthened

North American Trade Agreement, because in the end, USMCA will not be a Republican win or a Democratic win, but a win for the American people, and a stronger, more prosperous alliance with our North American trading partners.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), the chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, who also made an invaluable effort in terms of the working group that assembled the document that we will vote on this afternoon.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL for his extraordinary efforts.

Twenty-five years ago, NAFTA passed over strong opposition, with serious flaws.

At the beginning of this Congress, we were given a bill by the administration that didn't address those problems. It didn't have the votes to pass and it didn't deserve to pass.

I am proud of the work with our chairman; with our working group; the Speaker, who periodically invested huge amounts of time to keep it on track; and, of course, Ambassador Lighthizer, who was a great partner working with us.

We are voting today on an agreement that has fundamentally been rewritten and strengthened.

A personal priority for me was stripping unnecessary and harmful special provisions for Big Pharma. We have strengthened labor protections and enforcement. These are game changers. The help of AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka and, again, the Speaker were invaluable.

We have had environmental improvements. My colleague from Oregon, SUZANNE BONAMICI, deserves great praise for being tenacious on that. We will attack the raw sewage many of us saw flowing into the Pacific in Tijuana.

We finally have come to an agreement that can and should be passed.

I appreciate the hard work of all our colleagues, and hope that this is a foundation that we can move forward on to deal with challenges we have with a global economy with the same spirit of cooperation and innovation.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BUCHANAN), the leading Republican on the Trade Subcommittee, who deserves great credit for this trade agreement.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement. I want to say up front, I am so excited about this bipartisan effort, that is going to make a big difference for American workers.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank our leaders on our committee: Leader BRADY, Chairman NEAL, Chairman BLUMENAUER. I want to thank all of them, because this has been a team ef-

fort. It is exciting to see that once in a while.

What the House passes today will bring us one step closer to finally modernizing and balancing the 25-year-old North American Free Trade Agreement, which supports nearly \$1.3 trillion in economic activity and more than 12 million American jobs.

Passing USMCA will update the United States' critical trading relationships with our North American neighbors into the 21st century, a high-standard deal that benefits American workers, businesses, and the economy.

□ 1100

In fact, according to the independent International Trade Commission, USMCA will boost our economy by \$68 billion and create an additional 175,000 new jobs.

International trade is critical to my home State of Florida, where we export more than \$12 billion worth of goods and services to Canada and Mexico, supporting more than 700,000 jobs.

Leveling the playing field for Florida and the country, as well as increasing access to our foreign markets, is critical to growing the U.S. economy and creating good-paying jobs.

Florida has 15 deepwater seaports, including Port Manatee in my district. Florida exports tens of billions of dollars in goods and services annually and adds more than \$100 billion in economic value to our State.

I also congratulate President Trump because this is something for the last 3 or 4 years he has been very passionate about, and Ambassador Lighthizer because, without him and his effort, I am not sure we would be here today.

Madam Speaker, I urge support for this landmark trade agreement.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), whose legendary work on behalf of America is well known to all.

Mr. LEWIS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, Chairman NEAL, for all of his hard and great work. He never gave up; he never gave in. He kept the faith, and he kept his eyes on the prize.

I thank all of my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, from the Ways and Means Committee for finding a way to get us to the point where we are today.

Twenty-six years ago, I opposed NAFTA with every bone in my body. I never thought the day would come when we would have the opportunity to right some of the wrongs in that agreement.

NAFTA failed our workers. It failed our Mexican brothers and sisters. It failed Mother Earth.

NAFTA destroyed the hopes and dreams of a generation. It wiped out communities. It started a race to the bottom.

With this vote, we have a chance to reset the clock, to chart a new path, and to create a new trade model.

We can always do more, but today, we build a new foundation for trade

policy, a floor that reflects our values as a people and as a nation.

I thank the working group and all of our trade staff for working day in and day out. They were determined to do right.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY), a free-market conservative who is an outstanding chairman of the Republican Conference.

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the Republican leader of the Ways and Means Committee, my friend Mr. BRADY, for all of his hard work, and Chairman NEAL, as well, for his work on this.

Sadly, Madam Speaker, last night, on the floor of this House, the Democrats impeached the President of the United States without any direct evidence. After that, we learned that, despite the fact that they claimed, for months, that impeachment was an urgent matter, Speaker PELOSI is refusing to send the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate. I suppose we shouldn't be surprised, as Leader MCCONNELL, moments ago, said that these articles are a reflection of very shoddy work and a rigged and rushed process.

The American voters will not forget the travesty that the House Democrats have overseen. Had they not been obsessed with impeaching President Trump, we could have approved this very deal a year ago. The bipartisan nature of this deal that we are here discussing today cannot cover up what happened on this floor last night.

Trade with Mexico and Canada is vital to our economy in my home State of Wyoming. Exports from Wyoming to our North American partners totaled \$207 million in 2018. This USMCA will open countless new opportunities for Wyoming businesses, especially our agriculture producers selling our goods like wheat and beef, increasing export opportunities and the thousands of jobs supported by trade in Wyoming.

USMCA will also benefit our small- and medium-sized businesses, which already comprise 67 percent of our State's exports of machinery to Canada and Mexico.

For too long, NAFTA allowed countries to take advantage of U.S. workers. USMCA, negotiated by the President, is vital to strengthening our relationship with our North American trade partners while still holding Canada and Mexico accountable.

Madam Speaker, I support this crucial trade deal because it will bring tremendous benefits to my home State of Wyoming and all across the Nation, and I urge its approval today.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, this agreement is good for moving more commerce across our three countries. It means more jobs, and it means lower prices for consumers. That is especially important in Texas where the original

NAFTA was signed only a few blocks from my San Antonio office: Mexico, our top trading partner; Canada, our second.

Some were so eager for this commerce that would be produced by continuing NAFTA that they were willing to accept most any agreement. But, we insisted that we get a much-improved agreement to address the legitimate concerns of those who raised objection to previous agreements.

What we have today is an initial step, an important step, toward achieving a truly 21st century trade agreement that not only encourages trade but protects the environment and recognizes the legitimate concerns of workers. This victory results from major changes in what President Trump proposed 14 months ago.

First, we secured additional funding for the North American Development Bank, the NAD Bank, based in San Antonio, which is important in addressing especially environmental concerns.

Second, and very significantly, we deleted the horrible Big Pharma power grab to extend its monopoly power for prescription price gouging.

Third, each country was forced to take all necessary measures to comply with multilateral environmental agreements which take precedence over trade. This includes an additional recent agreement to dramatically reduce heat-trapping chemicals. In 2021, when we have a new president who actually believes in science, the agreement will facilitate, not impede, our response to the climate crisis.

And, finally, instead of platitudes, we have an enforceable agreement to address worker concerns. Let's celebrate a major step forward in building broad public support for trade.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), an outstanding technology leader on the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, I know we all had the points we want to walk through, but can I actually take a step sideways and do more a unified theory reason why I think getting this done is so incredibly important.

We talk about our issues with trade with China. We are living in a time right now where supply chains are choosing where to move around the world. The fact of the matter is that we are going to move North America into a stable, much more robust trading bloc where we know what the rules are. It gives us a chance to try to draw much more of the world's supply chains—manufacturing, trade, and commerce—as we get to be one of the key hubs in the world. The rancor, the fragility, the disagreements—hopefully that is behind us now.

Being from the State of Arizona, we also accomplished a number of things in this trade agreement that are really important. The *de minimis* rules,

where small businesses, internet-based businesses, now have a fighting chance to engage in commerce back and forth across the border, and some of the other rules of protections of IP and data, we truly have modernized much of this agreement.

Will this help the United States? I sure hope so because you see a number of predictions that this draws almost a half a percent of GDP in growth. That is wonderful. I wish we could have done this a year ago, but we are finally getting it done.

We are living almost in a miracle of economic growth and economic stability. This just adds one more leg so we can keep this going. We got the tax policy right. We also have the international part of the tax policy right. Now, hopefully, we are getting part of the trade right. Can we continue to live this economic expansion miracle longer? I will make the argument that getting this USMCA done is incredibly important to this success.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, we consider it a bit of a miracle that the gentleman did not show up with his charts.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), whose invaluable work on the committee and a steady hand all of the time is very much appreciated.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the USMCA implementing legislation.

As a member of the working group, I can tell you how far we have come. The original agreement that was sent to Congress was a total failure at protecting workers' rights, providing access to affordable medicine, and protecting our environment. Further, it wasn't enforceable.

The bill we have before us today is the result of tireless work from Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NEAL, and the working group members who represented the diverse views of Congress.

With gains achieved through our negotiations, this trade deal will set the standard for all future trade agreements. It is enforceable; it protects workers; it helps address serious environmental issues; and it protects access to affordable medicine.

Finally, I thank the staff, which worked tirelessly to get us to this day. There were a lot of late nights and a lot of weekends sacrificed to reach this deal. Specifically, I thank the Katherines, Katherine Tai and Katherine Monge; the Trade Subcommittee staff, Alexandra Whittaker, John Catalfamo, Julia Friedman, Kate Connor Linton, Katie White, and Keigan Mull; and from my staff, my trade person, Jennifer Goedke.

I commend the Speaker, the chairman, and all the Members who worked so hard to get us here. All of those good things that both sides have been talking about today were not in the first draft that we got from the White House. This is a good bill because we made it a good bill. I ask everybody to support this bill.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the outstanding Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY for yielding. I thank all the people who we have worked with to get to this point because passing the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement is going to be a major victory for American workers, yet another sign that we can improve on our current trade relationships.

I think a lot of people were concerned that maybe the President would pull out of NAFTA because he was clearly critical of the flaws of the previous agreement. But what he did was actually go and negotiate with Mexico and get a better deal for American workers. Then he went to Canada, which might have been a little more reluctant, but he got a better deal with Canada, as well.

What you see is not only a trade agreement that is a major win for the American economy—conservative estimates show over 160,000 new jobs get created. Agriculture gets a big win because many of our products that we can't sell to Canada now will be able to be sent to those markets.

This shows how Congress can work with this administration to do something that is really good for American workers.

□ 1115

But what it also does, Madam Speaker, is it sends a message to the rest of the world that we can work with our friends to get better trade deals, our other friends around the world like Japan, like the United Kingdom, who would like to work to get better trade deals. But if you can't get a deal from your neighbors from the north and south, you surely are not going to be able to get a deal with anyone else.

Now, this tells them that we can close deals and that there are other countries lining up that want to be a part of this economy. We have the hottest economy in the world, and it is only going to get better for workers here.

But it then sends a message to China that not just America wants to send, but a message that all of our allies around the world want to send, that when you do business with America, you have to follow the rules. You can't play by your own set of rules. And now, for enforcement of deals, it really shows that China is going to have to become part of the world economy and play by the rules that everyone else in the world plays by.

That is an important win for all of those forgotten men and women across this country who appreciate the work President Trump has done, Bob Lighthizer, who has been his quarterback on this all the way through, and everyone else. So it is going to be a big win for our country and for our economy.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a member of the working task force that assembled the document in front of us today, again, whose keen mind and good sense is always very helpful to these debates.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I want to commend Ranking Member BRADY and our colleagues on the other side as well. It is always a pleasure to know what this body can do when we work together.

I also want to associate myself with the remarks of the chairman for his incredible leadership. In his opening remarks, he underscored the key word that is central to this agreement that is far different from the previous NAFTA agreement. It is "enforcement." It was his tenacity and the tenacity of the working group and the subcommittee that made this happen.

I commend Speaker PELOSI for her work and, clearly, for all the working members of the task force for the effort they put forward. MIKE THOMPSON has already credited the staff for their outstanding work, and I specifically want to thank ROSA DELAURO, who also was there for the first NAFTA vote as well and is a strong and a tenacious defender of labor.

The work of ROSA DELAURO, the work of President Trump, the work of Ambassador Lighthizer, these were salient reasons that underscored Mr. NEAL's premise that enforcement at all levels, but specifically as it related to labor and environment, needed to be put in place.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the elite Republican leader of the Select Revenue Measures Subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I almost heard my colleague Mr. LARSON appreciate, I thought I heard him say President Trump, but then he did say "Trump," so I guess maybe not so much similarity there. But the fact of the matter is I appreciate the few nudges that we have seen over the last few weeks that have brought us to this point.

And I certainly appreciate the work of Ambassador Lighthizer and many on President Trump's team who have worked so hard to get us to this point.

Representing an agriculture powerhouse district, the Third District of Nebraska, where our farmers and ranchers work very diligently and very efficiently to help feed America and the world, we need good markets for them. Trade relationships in North America are so important, and we have this opportunity to modernize NAFTA, heading us in the direction of even more markets and really reflecting the needs of our economy and the economy across North America.

We have got this opportunity to bring people together, especially in light of events this week. I certainly appreciate this opportunity and our

leaders on the Ways and Means Committee, both Mr. BRADY and the chairman as well.

This is a great time to work together. I look forward to its passage and urge everyone to vote "yes."

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND). His advocacy on behalf of agriculture is well-known to all in this body.

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I rise in proud support of this trade agreement. It is important that we have a strong trading relationship with our two border neighbors, Mexico and Canada, our two biggest export markets.

I just caution my colleagues who choose to vote "no" on this that a "no" vote is a return to the failed policy of the old NAFTA, the status quo, rather than this more modernized version.

I am happy that dairy farmers in America are going to have greater access to the Canadian market.

We made progress on poultry and eggs.

We also tightened up the sanitary and phytosanitary standards so that those decisions have to be made on sound science rather than arbitrary decisions to block our agricultural exports.

We have, perhaps, the strongest worker protection chapter ever in the trade agreement, enhanced environmental standards, all to level the playing field for our workers, our farmers, our businesses so they can fairly compete rather than trying to compete in a race to the bottom.

Perhaps most importantly, we have the strongest enforcement chapter ever, and we look forward to working with Mexico and Canada to implement it the right way to make sure we are all playing by the same rules.

So this is solid, and I want to commend the chair, the ranking member, the working group, but also the staff for the countless hours that they put in to get us to this place, but especially Ambassador Bob Lighthizer for his perseverance and patience throughout these months.

These were difficult negotiations. This is what bipartisanship looks like on the House floor, where we are able to get this across the floor.

I encourage my colleagues to support this agreement, support the Northern Hemisphere economy. Show the rest of the world that we are back in business.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a Main Street businessman and the Republican leader of the Oversight Subcommittee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is great to stand here today, and what a difference a day makes. It is really good to see Members on both sides of the aisle stand up and say: You know, we are really getting things done for America.

I would like to say that this is a Christmas gift that is wrapped up in paper that is red, white, and blue. It is a jobs bill: 176,000 jobs, \$68 billion in new revenue. And this was arrived at because, in 2016, a candidate for the Presidency made the same commitment that everybody who ever runs for the Presidency says: If I get elected, I am going to make sure that we replace NAFTA with something that makes sense for American workers.

Promise made, promise kept. The 45th President of the United States has been on a tear improving this economy.

Now, having said all that—and I do have friends on both sides of the aisle. I just think that sometimes when we are on the floor here, it is impossible to show that.

There is a saying at Christmastime that says: Peace on Earth, and good will to men.

That is not the saying. It is: Peace on Earth to men of goodwill. That is a saying we need to take here.

One story I will share with you: As a child, I used to write a letter to Santa Claus every Christmas, and I would tell him everything I wanted. I would come down Christmas morning, and I never got everything I wanted, but I was sure as heck thankful for everything I got.

This is a tremendous jobs bill for America. This is a tremendous accomplishment. I can't imagine anybody not voting for this.

But I do want to take this opportunity to wish all of us a very Merry Christmas, and all of the people back home.

For the staffs on both sides, I thank them for everything they did.

This is the way that America is supposed to work and should continue to work as we end 2019 and go into 2020. It is a wonderful opportunity to show America that, on the people's floor in the House of Representatives, we can actually get things done.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, it is always an honor to endorse the Speaker of the House and to welcome her to the floor, but also to point something out.

On weekends, from Brussels, from Madrid, from Paris, she called me. And on the final weekend, time and again, with the U.S. trade rep on the line, the three of us went back and forth with Rich Trumka, who was in Pennsylvania on vacation, who couldn't have cell access until 5 o'clock in the evening. The Speaker was totally involved in this endeavor.

But most importantly, she called me in the middle of a Patriots game, and I was smart enough to take the call.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, that is while I was watching what was happening with the San Francisco 49ers and the Baltimore Ravens. Sports, sports, the center of our lives. That is the unifying factor.

We all are for our teams—aren't we?—and, hopefully, we are all Team

USA. Now we can prove that on this U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

While I was calling the distinguished chairman, I was in Brussels for the 75th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge. We had a bipartisan delegation there to thank our veterans. All of them were in their nineties, many of whom who were there, so we could thank them personally and be there to see them acknowledged by heads of state and the rest.

In terms of Spain, it was about we are still in it when it comes to the Paris accord. So, work, work, work.

But this was a priority, and time was important. We were trying to get it done as soon as it met the standards that we share.

I proudly rise to join my colleagues on this exciting day as the House passes a historic trade agreement that is truly worthy of the American people, a new and dramatically improved U.S.-Canada-Mexico trade agreement.

I salute Chairman RICHARD NEAL, a lifelong champion for working people, the maestro in the House on our side of this process, who helped deliver a trade agreement that will serve as a model for future trade agreements.

I thank each member of the Trade Working Group who worked so hard to improve the product that was sent originally by the administration nearly 2 years ago to where we are now.

I thank Chairman BLUMENAUER, chairman of the Trade Subcommittee, walking in now; Congresswoman ROSA DE LAURO; Congressman JOHN LARSON; Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY; Congressman MIKE THOMPSON; Congresswoman TERRI SEWELL; Congresswoman SUZANNE BONAMICI; and Congressman JIMMY GOMEZ, each of them working on the different categories that are mentioned: enforcement, labor rights, environmental protections, and pharmaceuticals.

I thank every Member for their wisdom, leadership, and commitment to delivering for the people during this process.

I was just asked in a press conference: Aren't you giving President Trump—Mr. BRADY always asks this question—aren't you giving the President a victory to boast about?

I said: That would be collateral benefit if we could come together to support America's working families. And if the President wants to take credit, so be it. That would not stand in the way of our passing this. However, I do want to point out some of the distance we have come from the President's original product.

The House Democratic Caucus is united in our values and our priority to making progress for America's working families in everything we do, including this trade agreement.

We all thank Trade Representative Lighthizer, Mr. Ambassador, for being an honest broker and straight shooter with us as we worked toward an agreement. Not every day was without its, shall we say, exuberances, but this day

is possible because of the hard work of many Members representing every corner of our country.

We thank Richard Trumka, president of the AFL-CIO, a true warrior for workers, who helped secure an agreement that is light-years better than what the administration proposed 2 years ago.

Democrats knew that hardworking Americans needed more from the USMCA than just some broken NAFTA with better language but no real enforcement. That was my concern: We just can't come up with a bill that is a little sugar on the top and say this is better, because the impact on workers would be felt for a long time to come. And we knew we could do better.

The original USMCA draft put forth by the administration fell far short of where it is now. It still left many American workers exposed to losing their jobs to Mexico; included unacceptable provisions, locking in high drug prices; came up short on key environmental standards; critically lacked the tough, effective enforcements that are essential to protect American jobs and holding our trading partners accountable to their promises.

After months of Democrats working with the Trade Representative, we have key changes to the USMCA that make this a truly transformative agreement for America's workers.

Now, with Democratic changes, the USMCA has the strongest enforcement mechanism of any U.S. trade agreement. Again, in contrast to the original USMCA draft which would have allowed nations that do not live up to their obligations to stop enforcement complaints from even being heard, Democrats' changes prevented nations from panel blocking.

For workers, while the administration drafts stack the deck against labor violation claims, our changes enact new rules and monitoring tools to protect American workers, prosecute labor violations, and ensure that Mexico is complying with labor reforms.

Other points that are for the workers include establishing labor attaches based in Mexico who will provide on-the-ground information about Mexico's labor practices and creating a facility-specific rapid response law enforcement mechanism to stop trade in goods that violate this agreement.

These are not technical changes. These make a big difference.

□ 1130

For the environment, whereas the administration's draft had weak environmental rules and tilted the playing field against violation claims, democrats have strengthened the rules and enforcement tools and are lowering pollution and increasing resilient infrastructure.

Sadly, while the administration refuses to acknowledge the existence, let alone the urgency, of the climate crisis, our changes in the USMCA set a

firm footing for progress when we have a President who brings us back to the Paris accord.

And, by the way, when we were in Spain on this subject, our large bicameral delegation's theme was "we are still in" when it came to the Paris accord.

For lowering prescription drug costs, the White House draft contained unacceptable giveaways for Big Pharma that would have locked in high prescription drug prices.

Democrats have eliminated these unfair handouts to big corporations and secured provisions to lower drug costs and improve access to life-saving medicines.

The changes House Democrats have secured in the USMCA make this a truly transformational trade agreement. As the AFL-CIO wrote in their letter of support last week, we have secured an agreement that working people can proudly support.

Working people are responsible for a deal that is a vast improvement over the original NAFTA and the flawed proposal brought forward in 2017. For the first time, there truly will be enforceable labor standards.

The USMCA also eliminates special carve-outs for corporations like the big giveaway to Big Pharma in the administration's initial proposal and loopholes designed to make it harder to prosecute labor violations.

The USMCA is far from perfect, but there is no denying that the trade rules in America are fairer because of the hard work of so many people, and our perseverance. Working people have created a new standard for future trade negotiations.

Indeed, the strength of Democrats' USMCA is recognized by endorsements from groups representing tens of millions of Americans across industries and geographies: labor groups and trade organizations; farmers, growers, and ranchers; groups representing businesses around the country; social justice, and faith-based organizations, such as NETWORK.

The list goes on and on, and it will be part of the statement that I include in the RECORD.

This is a strong agreement that honors our promises For the People to give us bigger paychecks and makes a difference for millions.

With all the respect in the world for our neighbors, our respect for the greatness of Mexico as our neighbor, and the friendship that we have and want to engender, and our neighbor to the north, Canada, with respect to them, our responsibility is to have a trade agreement that lifts all workers in our hemisphere. Our first responsibility is to American workers.

I urge a bipartisan vote for the USMCA and urge Senator MCCONNELL to take the bill up quickly. We can send it right over, and he can take it up anytime.

If the Senate Republicans care about workers, they will no doubt join us to

send this bill to the President's desk in the House and in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, I commend our chairman, RICHARD NEAL, for his outstanding work. I know that you have a good rapport with Ranking Member BRADY. I thank all the Members who are responsible for bringing this to the floor.

AFL-CIO,
December 10, 2019.

AFL-CIO ENDORSES USMCA AFTER
SUCCESSFULLY NEGOTIATING IMPROVEMENTS
LABOR FEDERATION PRESIDENT RICHARD
TRUMKA ON THE UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CAN-
ADA AGREEMENT (USMCA), PROVIDED FINAL
TEXT ACCURATELY REFLECTS CHANGES:

Make no mistake, we demanded a trade deal that benefits workers and fought every single day to negotiate that deal; and now we have secured an agreement that working people can proudly support.

I am grateful to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and her allies on the USMCA working group, along with Senate champions like Sherrod Brown and Ron Wyden, for standing strong with us throughout this process as we demanded a truly enforceable agreement. I also commend Ambassador Robert Lighthizer for being a straight shooter and an honest broker as we worked toward a resolution.

Working people are responsible for a deal that is a vast improvement over both the original NAFTA and the flawed proposal brought forward in 2017. For the first time, there truly will be enforceable labor standards—including a process that allows for the inspections of factories and facilities that are not living up to their obligations.

The USMCA also eliminates special carve outs for corporations like the giveaway to Big Pharma in the administration's initial proposal and loopholes designed to make it harder to prosecute labor violations.

The USMCA is far from perfect. It alone is not a solution for outsourcing, inequality or climate change. Successfully tackling these issues requires a full-court press of economic policies that empower workers, including the repeal of tax cuts which reward companies for shipping our jobs overseas.

But there is no denying that the trade rules in America will now be fairer because of our hard work and perseverance. Working people have created a new standard for future trade negotiations.

President Trump may have opened this deal. But working people closed it. And for that, we should be very proud.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP), who is a key member of the Ways and Means Committee and who hails from a huge trade State.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, for over a year the administration and Republicans in Congress have emphasized the urgency of passing the new United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the USMCA.

With this bipartisan vote, and with the hard work from both sides of the aisle, we finally have the opportunity to rebalance North American trade. In spite of delays, this opportunity that exists for all Americans is finally here today.

It has been 25 years since our North American Trade Agreement was established, and it has not been updated to reflect the modern economy.

Under this new trade agreement, our farmers, manufacturers, and workers

will finally have a deal that modernizes North American trade, boosts our economy, and strengthens our Nation's role in the global trading market.

American farmers will now have increased access to the Canadian market to sell products like dairy, poultry, eggs, and wheat, a vast improvement over the status quo.

It improves intellectual property provisions that will protect innovation, safeguard American trade secrets in Canada and Mexico, though certain protections could be stronger.

USMCA also modernizes trade with Canada and Mexico by establishing a new gold-standard digital trade chapter to continue the growth of our digital economy. It includes a new chapter dedicated to helping small- and medium-sized businesses, which make up 98 percent of our Nation's exporters.

Our economy relies on trade with our North American neighbors, and these additions will support American companies, farmers, and workers. In fact, USMCA is predicted to create over \$68 billion in new economic activity and 176,000 new jobs here in America.

USMCA is a win for the United States and a win for North America. At long last, Americans will have an updated trade agreement that works for them. The stage is set for further agreements that help hardworking Americans.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the President, Ambassador Lighthizer, and all of my colleagues for working so hard on this over the last couple of years. I encourage Members to support this.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and Mr. BRADY. I thank Messrs. BLUMENAUER and BUCHANAN for the great job that they did. I also thank Mr. Lighthizer. He is a different kind of guy, and I really believe that he was essential to getting to this vote today.

In my entire political life, I have never had anyone say to me, as was said today, that if you vote against this, you are voting for the status quo.

I even have a Jerry Garcia tie on today. Me and the status quo don't agree most of the time.

So there are some questions that do remain.

The ship of human rights has not been righted. The President never once mentioned in any speech, during 2016 until now, about human rights and about workers' rights in discussing NAFTA. Mexican workers are still being treated like chattel, American jobs will still flow through other countries, and sham protection unions will still own the day. This bill has made many improvements, but it is not enough.

Some can say: Is there ever enough?

There are too many questions.

Will Mexico be held accountable to fully enforce their labor laws?

We don't know.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES), who is an outstanding new member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ESTES. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend from Texas for yielding, and I am proud to rise today to support the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

Since President Trump announced the USMCA over 1 year ago, I have urged my colleagues across the aisle to join us in supporting this important trade agreement and getting it across the finish line. Today, I am thrilled to speak on the floor and ask my colleagues to support it one last time.

The journey to this day has been longer and harder than it should have been. For too long USMCA has taken a backseat to some partisan politics causing farmers, ranchers, and workers across the country to miss out on economic growth and jobs in the meantime. However, today we are taking a giant step forward in finally making that free and fair trade deal a reality.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement will create 176,000 new jobs in our country and will boost the national GDP by \$68 billion. It is important for farmers and ranchers in my State. The USMCA opens up new markets for American dairy, wheat, chicken, eggs, and turkey for the first time. This deal also helps U.S. manufacturing jobs and increases wages.

NAFTA was created 25 years ago, and the USMCA will now be the first trade agreement with a chapter dedicated to digital trade and sets new standards for labor and the environment.

I want to thank President Trump and Ambassador Lighthizer for their incredible leadership over the last couple of years to follow through on another campaign pledge and negotiate this update to NAFTA. I also want to thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY for their leadership to ensure that our Ways and Means Committee and Congress were involved in this process all along the way.

This is an important victory for President Trump and for millions of farmers, ranchers, and workers across our country who will benefit from the USMCA. As a strong advocate for free and fair trade, I proudly support the USMCA and look forward to working with the Senate to send this to the President's desk as soon as possible.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who is a well-known champion of all things Chicago and a great advocate of working men and women.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I have always been told, if there is righteousness in the heart, then there is beauty in the character. I think what we have seen this week and what we are seeing today is the righteousness of the Members of this House who take the position that

neither side will get everything that it wants.

I certainly won't get everything that I want for the State of Illinois, but I have got dairy farmers—not as many as RON KIND may have in Wisconsin—I have got corn growers in Illinois and soybean growers—maybe not as many as there are in Iowa. But the comprehensiveness of the communities that we represent demand that we come together.

So I want to commend Chairman NEAL, our ranking member, the working group, and the Speaker of the House because it took all of them to make this work.

So, Madam Speaker, I am going to vote for it. I admit that I feel a great deal like BILL PASCRELL, but I am going to vote for it because we need to come together and do what we can for the American people.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. WALORSKI), who is a happy Hoosier and a champion for low tariffs and free trade.

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I am indeed happy, and I am thrilled today to actually be here and cast my vote for the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or the USMCA. I can't tell you enough of what it will do for our districts in northern Indiana.

The hardworking Hoosiers in Indiana's Second District are builders and growers. We manufacture most of the RVs you see on the road and a large portion of boats and trailers that you see on many lakes. We manufacture auto parts and musical instruments. Our farmers put food on the table, including corn, soybeans, pork, duck, eggs, and dairy products. Mexico and Canada are key export markets for all of them and the workers they employ.

It has been 25 years since NAFTA has been in force. Technology, transportation, and consumer habits have all evolved; NAFTA, however, stayed the same. Politicians promised the sky when it came to trade agreements, but President Trump promised to modernize NAFTA, and, unlike anyone else, he kept that promise with USMCA.

USMCA dismantles trade barriers that stood in the way of American exports for so long. For farmers in my district, this means more dairy, more poultry, and more eggs are heading to Canada. For manufacturers, this means fewer paperwork headaches that slow down shipments and prevent them altogether. For businesses of all sizes, types, and shapes, this means e-commerce standards that promote fair competition and that will be used as a standard in future agreements. For workers, this means more jobs staying in the United States.

Robust enforcement ensures that the potential of the USMCA does not evaporate overnight. The promises made by all sides will be promises kept by all sides.

Madam Speaker, this day is long overdue, but I am so happy it is finally

here. Our economy is booming thanks to tax cuts and regulatory reforms, and now USMCA will keep that momentum going. It will put more money in workers' pockets, and it will help small businesses thrive.

It is a big win for President Trump and Ambassador Lighthizer, and it is a big win for America.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this agreement.

□ 1145

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Buffalo, New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the economic future of Buffalo and western New York is tied strategically to southern Ontario, which is one-third of the entire population of the country of Canada.

I am pleased that this agreement strengthens the U.S.-Canadian economic and life quality relations. I am concerned, however, that the U.S.-Mexican economic relationship is more challenging.

The United States has lost 6 million manufacturing jobs in the past 20 years, and 53,000 manufacturing businesses have closed. NAFTA's promise of wage convergence, bringing Mexican wages to Canadian and U.S. standards, has failed. The Mexican wage is \$5.10 a day, less than \$0.64 an hour.

We have good reason to be skeptical of Mexico's commitment to do better. The USMCA, however, because of Chairman RICHARD NEAL's leadership and emphasis on rigorous enforcement, does have the potential for improved Mexican compliance on wages, the environment, and labor standards.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MARCHANT), a leader on free trade from the Dallas-Fort Worth area.

Mr. MARCHANT. Madam Speaker, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement is a revolutionary trade deal that will usher in a new era of economic prosperity and growth for Americans across the country.

Texas, in particular, stands ready to thrive under this agreement. Our State exports more to Mexico than any other and is second in exports to Canada. Each year, over \$135 billion worth of Texan goods are sent to our two closest trading partners, supporting over 114,000 jobs in Texas.

The reforms in the USMCA will ensure that we continue to have free and fair access to international marketplaces, keeping prices low for Americans and business booming for business and workers.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member, my good friend, for shepherding this through. Members on the other side of the aisle, I have been in legislatures for a long time, and I always believed that, on this bill, you were trying to get to "yes" on it. I appreciate the hours that

you met, and Texas will appreciate every vote that is cast for this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who, again, was an invaluable member of the Trade Working Group. Her advocacy for people in her constituency is well known to all.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this trade deal. I was honored that Speaker PELOSI asked me to join the Democratic Trade Working Group.

We, the Gang of 8, along with you, Mr. Chairman, worked tirelessly for 6 months, negotiating with Bob Lighthizer, the U.S. Ambassador on trade. We took what was a very weak and unenforceable trade deal and made it into a renegotiated trade agreement that will protect American workers and businesses.

This bill we vote on today is a renegotiated USMCA. I am particularly proud that the working group won two major concessions on enforcement. First, we closed the panel-blocking loophole and created a strong state-to-state mechanism for enforcement. Second, we created a first-of-its-kind rapid response mechanism to improve labor enforcement in Mexico.

This deal is a win for the Steelworkers and Teamsters in my Alabama district. It is a win for the automobile manufacturers and steel industry in the State of Alabama. It is a win for Alabama farmers and agriculture producers.

This renegotiated trade agreement is a much-improved North American Free Trade Agreement, and it is because of that that I ask my fellow colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I, again, thank Chairman NEAL, Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI, my fellow Gang of 8 working group members, as well as Bob Lighthizer, and our especially hard-working staff. I thank, especially, Katherine Tai and my own staffer, Rob Nuttall, for all of their hard work on getting us there.

I do believe that this is a win for everyone, and I urge my colleagues to support this new, renegotiated USMCA.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a champion in manufacturing and the Republican leader of Subcommittee on Social Security.

Mr. REED. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today because this is a good day. I don't want to discuss yesterday. I don't want to discuss issues that divide us in this Chamber.

I want to discuss, today, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement because that has brought us together. When we come together, who wins in that situation? Not us as Members of the House of Representatives, not us here in Washington, D.C., but the American people.

I was reminded recently, this morning, that, about 2 years ago, we delivered on tax cuts, and I stood exactly

right here, and I knew that was going to unleash the American economy. We have an economy now at an all-time high, with 50-year lows for unemployment and 1.4 million new jobs in America.

Today, we have come together for the American worker, the American farmer. We have united as Democrats and Republicans to do something good for our fellow citizens, and that is this updated United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

As I stood here 2 years ago and had a discussion with my good friend from New York, Mr. Crowley, who is no longer here, I declared in one voice saying, hell, yes, I am going to vote for those tax cuts, and, hell, yes, I am going to vote for this Mexico-Canada trade agreement, because what we are doing here is, again, unleashing the power of America. Standing together, it is amazing what we can accomplish.

Madam Speaker, I applaud Chairman NEAL. I applaud the Democratic Trade Working Group. I applaud the other side of the aisle for standing with us today for the American workers and American farmers.

I also applaud President Trump for having the vision and the leadership to take on this issue when everyone told him it cannot be done.

Madam Speaker, I also applaud KEVIN BRADY, VERN BUCHANAN, and DEVIN NUNES, and members of the Committee on Ways and Means who stood forward and said: You know what we are going to do? We are going to make sure we stand for a principle we believe in. That is the American opportunity of a job in an economy that is growing and playing on a field across the world where we have a fair and level playing field of trade. Because, when we have fair, free trade, the American worker wins each and every day.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), whose well-acknowledged efforts on behalf of the best and most important trade State in the country, Washington, as well as being a knowledgeable forecaster of international economics for all benefit all of us on the committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement and the implementing legislation.

Congressional Democrats worked hard to secure labor-specific enforcement tools and robust environmental provisions that make this agreement a substantial improvement over the original NAFTA.

Most importantly, this new agreement helps many of my constituents. Now, our dairy farmers will have greater market access to Canada, and our wineries will have an easier time selling their wine in British Columbia.

When this new agreement is in place, it will be the first U.S. trade agree-

ment with a digital trade chapter. It includes provisions on data localization, cross-border data flows, and other requirements that preserve a free and open internet. That is important to all segments of our economy.

My district is home to a vibrant technology industry that is responsible for thousands of good-paying jobs and helps power America's large trade surplus in digital services.

Madam Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this agreement.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), Republican leader of the Health Subcommittee and the outstanding leader of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those kind words, and I am pleased that we have overcome numerous delays and are finally passing a North American trade deal for the 21st century.

USMCA will create jobs, boost the economy, and strengthen our relationship with our neighbors in Canada and Mexico. I want to express my gratitude to Ambassador Robert Lighthizer and his team, and Gregg Doud and his staff, for the hard work they have done on this agreement.

I also commend the President for delivering, yet again, for American farmers and workers under USMCA. Under this agreement, ag products that had zero tariffs under NAFTA will continue to be tariff-free. Our farmers and ranchers will gain additional access to the remaining protected sectors. Enforcement will be enhanced to ensure the agreement is implemented correctly.

Updated dispute mechanisms will ensure the United States has prompt access to a dispute settlement panel, when needed, to allow U.S. businesses to compete on a level playing field.

This is a great bipartisan agreement that will bring huge benefits to millions of Americans, and I urge my colleagues to support USMCA.

Finally, I thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY for all of their great work on this. I know it was not easy, but you guys did a really great work. I think the American people owe you a debt of gratitude.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), another invaluable member of the Committee on Ways and Means whose knowledge about southern California is very important to all of us.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the improved USMCA. With the changes demanded by Democrats from the original proposal, this agreement marks a historic step that will stop the bleeding of American jobs to other countries.

Free trade agreements have often meant lost jobs or lower wages for American workers, and the Trump ad-

ministration's initial USMCA was no different. But Democrats fought back to win new labor protections that make this deal actually work for Americans.

I have seen firsthand why these protections are so important. Earlier this year, I traveled on the Committee on Ways and Means' trip to Mexico to investigate the labor challenges we are facing.

At a Goodyear plant, I spoke directly to workers whose starting pay was only \$2 an hour and even less after deductions. Then, when these workers went on strike to demand better wages, nearly 50 labor leaders were harassed, threatened with violence, and fired. This means that a company that pays American workers \$23 an hour and made \$15.5 billion in sales last year would rather fire Mexican workers than pay them a fair wage.

It is one of the many examples that explains why companies outsource jobs and exploit labor in other countries. And it is why Democrats fought so hard for a USMCA deal with strong labor protections to ensure a level playing field.

This trade deal isn't perfect, but it is an important step in the right direction and protects American jobs.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), the food, fuel, and fiber capital of the world.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I couldn't have said that better myself. I thank the ranking member, my dear friend from the great State of Texas, for his leadership on this very important trade deal, our largest and most important relationship of all of our trading relationships.

I thank our chairman, Chairman NEAL, for keeping this thing on track and keeping people in the game so we could have a bipartisan consensus. That is the only way this could work, so the chairman is to be commended for his efforts.

But let's give credit where credit is due, for the one who led the charge, who did the heavy lifting, our President, Donald J. Trump. I am saying this because in 2016, he was already calling out some of these trade deals as a rip-off of American workers and manufacturers.

While NAFTA was a great deal for farmers and ranchers, we saw a 400 percent increase in trade for ag products since the inception of NAFTA. It hasn't been good all the way around. It hasn't been fair all the way around. It hasn't been productive, in terms of keeping jobs here in the United States.

□ 1200

So kudos to our President for his dogged commitment to American-first trade policies. That doesn't mean America only. It means that we negotiate from strength, and we negotiate what is in the best interest of American workers, manufacturers, and farmers.

That is what this does: \$70 billion in economic growth, 170,000 jobs, and billions in investment that will go into the auto manufacturing sector.

Our producers, dairy producers and other farmers, are going to have open access to new customers in Canada, so this is a huge win for America.

I want to join all my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, and champion this all the way through. So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, vote "yes" for USMCA, and vote for an even greater America and an even greater prospect for American prosperity.

God bless America.

Go west Texas.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), whose district I recently visited, a real champion of the airport, a real champion of the seaport, and a real champion of international economics.

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I would like to first thank the chairman and the working group for working together.

Trade can be a poverty buster. It is a powerful tool in the toolbox by increasing the earning power of our communities and creating well-paying jobs.

Coming from the city of Philadelphia, which nearly has 25 percent poverty, well-paying jobs are the difference between thriving and surviving. Let me say that again: thriving and surviving. That is why this is important.

Trade is especially beneficial to minority-owned businesses. Minority-owned exporting businesses average three times more workers and pay a wage premium of nearly \$16,000 more.

That is why I thank the chairman and the staff in the working group, because of their leadership. This really sends a message to the entire world that we want free trade, but also fair trade.

It is especially important to understand that everybody doesn't get everything they want. That is called negotiation.

Again, I stand here today, proudly, to say I am supporting this 100 percent.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding the time.

I rise today in support of the USMCA.

And let's call this what it is: It is a win for America. It is a win for our farmers. It is a win for our manufacturers. It is a win for our workers.

For the past 2½ years, so many people have worked tirelessly to ensure that this high-standard and modernized trade agreement got completed.

I would especially thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY and our Ways and Means staff for all the

hard work and the commitment and dedication to getting this done.

Also, to Bob Lighthizer. There is not a more capable trade ambassador that we have had than Bob Lighthizer. He has been relentless in his pursuit of getting this done.

Lastly, President Trump, it wouldn't have happened without him and what he did working with the Canadians and the Mexicans to get this trade agreement done.

This free and fair trade agreement benefits all of us, all sectors of our economy. Moreover, it will further support the record-breaking economic growth that this country has seen. We, arguably, have the best economy we have had in 40 years, and this will help that.

It is true that this agreement is not perfect. There are a few things that I would have liked to have seen done differently on sunset provision and ISDS and rules of origin.

But, at the end of the day, when you look at these 24 chapters and what it does to market access for agriculture, to digital trade provisions, USMCA puts America on top, and it shows the world that, with our two largest trading partners, Mexico and Canada, we can negotiate an agreement that is solid.

Remember, we represent 4½ percent of the world's population. We have to have markets around the world. This agreement sets the standard for doing that.

In Congress, I am proud to represent the 18th District of Illinois. It is the eighth largest district in terms of corn and soybean production. When I think about what this does for market access, breaking down barriers, this helps our farmers.

In Illinois, ag is the number one industry in our State. I think about our manufacturers and what this means for jobs and opportunities for them for products in Canada and Mexico.

The ability to sell our goods, products, and services around the world is absolutely vital to economic success in Illinois and across the country. Forty percent of the products we grow, produce, or manufacture in Illinois go to Canada or Mexico. This helps with that.

In closing, I would just say this is a good agreement. I look forward to supporting it, and I would ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), a very knowledgeable member of the Ways and Means Committee whose district I visited not that long ago.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague from Illinois.

This is a win for American workers, for their families, for their communities, and for our Nation as a whole.

I want to thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY, the working group, and, in particular, our staff, who

worked so hard, tirelessly, to bring this deal forward.

The USMCA legislation before us today is the result of many months of hard-fought negotiations between Congress and the administration, and it is a true victory for working people and our country.

Compared to the initial version of the agreement shared by the White House last year, the improved trade agreement before us today includes markedly stronger protections for American workers and crucially serious enforcement mechanisms that ensure all parties will follow the agreement.

While I believe the agreement includes higher standards to preserve our environment, I do regret the administration was unwilling to make any commitments to address the very real and pressing issues of climate change.

Nevertheless, the USMCA is a major step forward for American workers and businesses fighting to compete in an increasingly interconnected world. It also puts to rest the President's threat to pull out of NAFTA without the certainty of a replacement.

A testament to the hard-fought negotiations is the backing of this agreement from stakeholders as diverse as the AFL-CIO and the United States Chamber of Commerce.

I support the passage of the USMCA implementing language, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), an outstanding member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this is a great day for American workers.

The nameplate on my desk says, "Jobs, Jobs, Jobs," and that is exactly what this new trade agreement will bring.

You see, for too long, America was willing to accept trade agreements that were tilted against American workers because we were so far ahead of the rest of the world, but we are not so far ahead anymore.

Ross Perot was right all those years ago when he said the old NAFTA would bring a giant sucking sound of American jobs going to Mexico, and that is precisely what happened in my district.

Unfair trade agreements are one of the primary reasons that the American middle class has stagnated for decades—until the election of Donald Trump.

The new USMCA corrects much of this imbalance:

It will prevent the departure of many more Americans jobs;

It will bring hundreds of thousands of new jobs to America;

It will raise the wages of workers throughout North America; and

It will accelerate the growth of our American economy.

I am thankful for the talent and effort of Ambassador Lighthizer in successfully reaching this incredibly complicated trilateral agreement.

I am also thankful that we finally have a President with the backbone and determination to do what is necessary to bring our trading partners to the table, many of whom have taken advantage of us for far too long, and despite the criticism of many here in our own country. Our President is doing what is right and fair for America and American workers.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I am thankful that Speaker PELOSI has finally found a moment of sufficient political expedience that she would allow this vote to lift American workers.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), a very invaluable member of the Ways and Means Committee, advocate of the "Salad Bowl of the World," and a good friend.

Mr. PANETTA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of USMCA.

That is right. The chairman is absolutely correct. I represent the central coast of California, and I fondly call it the "Salad Bowl of the World."

With agriculture being our number one industry, trade with Canada and Mexico and, thus, the USMCA is very, very important. This deal will provide our farmers and ranchers with continued, yet improved, access to those important markets.

It will also strengthen those sanitary and phytosanitary standards and make sure that sound science is used when it comes to our food safety, and it helps California wine get into those Canadian markets.

When this administration first presented USMCA to Congress, I have to say, it was unacceptable. However, thanks to Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NEAL, the Trade Working Group and, you bet, Ambassador Lighthizer, we were able to come up with one of the strongest, most progressive deals in the United States' history.

The USMCA now has some of the most stringent labor standards, some of the most robust funding for enforceability, and some of the strongest requirements for the environment ever.

The USMCA frames a new floor for future trade agreements. It creates new confidence in our most important trading partners, and it provides protection for the future of our fresh produce on our farms, for the dignity of our workers, for the sanctity of our environment, and, yes, for the success of our economy and our hemisphere.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a series of statements in support of USMCA, including from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Information Technology Industry Council, the Business Roundtable, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Farm Bureau, who join a host of business, agriculture, technology, manufacturing, and small business organizations across America that have been instrumental in getting USMCA across the finish line.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
CONGRESSIONAL & PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, December 18, 2019.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce strongly supports H.R. 5430, the "United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) Implementation Act," which would strengthen trade ties that support millions of American jobs. The Chamber will include votes on this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

The case for approval of this legislation is strong. First, it would strengthen U.S. trade ties with Canada and Mexico, which are by far our most important export markets. More than 12 million American jobs—in sectors from agriculture and manufacturing to services and technology—depend on trade with our two North American neighbors. They are also the top two export destinations for U.S. small and medium-size businesses, more than 120,000 of which sell their goods and services to Canada and Mexico. The new pact would guarantee that virtually all U.S. exports enter these markets tariff-free.

Second, USMCA would modernize North American trade rules. When the North American Free Trade Agreement was negotiated a quarter of a century ago, there was no e-commerce, to give one example; consequently, the agreement did not address this sector. While USMCA falls short in several areas—including in intellectual property, which should not be considered a template for future agreements—its updated rules on digital trade, non-tariff barriers, services, and other areas promise substantial benefits.

Third, USMCA would restore certainty to these vital trade relationships. Tariffs and the threat of tariffs—applied to steel and aluminum, autos and auto parts, or applied to pursue non-trade objectives—have imposed real costs on the U.S. economy and dampened investment. Enactment of this new trade agreement would turn the page on this chapter and afford the business community the confidence it needs to invest and hire.

Implementation of USMCA would be a boon to U.S. companies and the workers they employ as they compete in our top two export markets. We urge the House to approve USMCA expeditiously.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE P. CLARK,
President,
U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI, MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: The undersigned Texas based business leaders and organizations urge your swift action and support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). Ratification of USMCA is critically needed to provide certainty for the many business sectors in Texas that rely on trade with Canada and Mexico, while in turn contributing to the U.S. economy.

Texas exports more than any other state to Mexico and is second only behind Michigan for exports to Canada. More than 950,000 Texas jobs are supported by trade with Mexico and Canada. In 2018, Texas exported more than \$137 billion worth of products to our North American partners, accounting for 43 percent of Texas' total exports to the world. These are staggering numbers that will only grow with the implementation of USMCA.

According to a recent independent International Trade Commission (ITC) report, USMCA will create more than 176,000 additional jobs and raise annual U.S. gross domestic product by \$68.2 billion. It will in-

crease U.S. exports to Canada by \$19.1 billion and to Mexico by \$14.2 billion. It is obvious USMCA will greatly benefit the Texas economy by spurring job growth and opening more trade access.

The manufacturing community in Texas heavily relies on passage of USMCA. In fact, Mexico and Canada purchase half of Texas' total global manufacturing exports. The Lone Star State's top exports to Mexico and Canada are petroleum and coal products, computer equipment, chemicals, motor vehicle parts, electrical equipment, semiconductors and electric components, fabricated metal products, plastics, engine, turbine and power transmission equipment and food and beverages. These exports totaled more than \$120 billion in 2018 and are responsible for more than 114,000 Texas jobs. Passage of USMCA will help Texas manufacturers be more competitive and create many more jobs in Texas and the U.S.

USMCA would also create much needed certainty for Texas farm and ranch families who contribute to the economy and feed and clothe millions worldwide. Over 60,400 Texas jobs are supported by exporting agricultural products to Mexico and Canada. The annual value of Texas' agricultural exports to our North American neighbors totals more than \$7.2 billion. USMCA would only build on these achievements by breaking down existing trade barriers and opening more market access for products like beef, dairy, corn, wheat and pork.

USMCA provides Texas with greater access to Canada's dairy, poultry and egg markets. It would enhance standards for biotechnology, reduce trade distorting policies, establish modern sanitary and phytosanitary standards and more. Combined with other agricultural provisions in USMCA, the ITC report estimates U.S. agricultural exports to Canada and the rest of the world would increase by \$2.2 billion.

Through updated automotive rules of origin, USMCA encourages manufacturing and economic growth by requiring that 75 percent of auto content be produced in North America. USMCA also drives higher wages by mandating 40-45 percent of auto content be made by workers earning at least \$16 per hour. These improvements will incentivize billions of dollars in additional U.S. vehicle and auto parts production while directly benefiting the Texas automotive industry.

USMCA also includes new provisions to strengthen and fully enforce environmental and labor obligations. The agreement requires parties to adopt and maintain in law and practice labor rights as recognized by the International Labor Organization. It requires worker representation in collective bargaining in Mexico, new provisions to take measures to prohibit the importation of goods produced by forced labor and to address violence against workers exercising their labor rights. These provisions make strides in leveling the playing field for Texas and U.S. workers and businesses.

USMCA also provides a strong framework to support North American energy trade. It will bolster North American competitiveness and help lower our reliance on energy imports from outside the region. It also maintains the free flow of energy across borders in North America through the continued zero-tariff treatment of U.S. energy exports to Mexico and Canada.

In addition, the new agreement will enable U.S. chemical manufacturers to create a North American model for chemical regulation while leveraging the highly-integrated, North American supply chain to reduce costs, boost U.S. exports and inject new growth and job creation throughout Texas and the U.S.

Further, Texas pharmaceutical and technology innovators will enjoy the strongest

protections for trade secrets contained in any U.S. trade agreement. USMCA also contains a new digital trade chapter that will facilitate the cross-border transfer of data and minimize limitations on where data must be stored.

As you can tell, passage of USMCA is vital to Texas and our country. We respectfully request that you quickly bring USMCA up for a vote in Congress and support its final passage. Hardworking Americans are counting on your leadership on this important issue.

Sincerely,

Texas Farm Bureau; Texas Association of Business; Accord Irrigation Technologies LLC; AgTexas Farm Credit Services; Allen/Fairview Chamber of Commerce; Apartment Association of Greater Dallas; Association of Texas Soil and Water Conservation Districts; Baytown Chamber of Commerce; Bryan/Colege Station Chamber of Commerce.

Cedar Park Chamber of Commerce; Cent-Tex Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; City of Coppell; DanHil Containers; Dallas Regional Chamber; Del Rio Chamber of Commerce; Denton Chamber of Commerce; DFW Minority Supplier Development Council, Inc.; Dumas Chamber of Commerce.

Earth Moving Contractors Association of Texas; El Paso Chamber of Commerce; El Paso Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Exotic Wildlife Association; Farm Credit Bank of Texas; Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce; Freese & Nichols, Inc.; Frisco Chamber of Commerce; Global Tooling Specialties, Inc.; Granbury Chamber of Commerce.

Grand Prairie Chamber of Commerce; Grapevine Chamber of Commerce; Greater Arlington Chamber of Commerce; Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce; Greater Austin Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Greater Dallas Asian American Chamber of Commerce; Greater Houston Partnership; Greater Irving-Las Colinas Chamber of Commerce; Greater Killeen Chamber of Commerce.

Greater Port Arthur Chamber of Commerce; Houston Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Imperative Information Group; Independent Cattlemen's Association of Texas; Ingleside Chamber of Commerce; Intelligent Compensation, LLC; International Bank of Commerce; Lamesa Area Chamber of Commerce; Longview Chamber of Commerce; Lubbock Chamber of Commerce.

McAllen Chamber of Commerce; McKinney Chamber of Commerce; Nacogdoches County Chamber of Commerce; North American Strategy for Competitiveness; North Dallas Chamber of Commerce; North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce; North Texas Commission; Onshore Resources; Plains Cotton Cooperative Association.

Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.; Plains Land Bank; Plano Chamber of Commerce; Richardson Chamber of Commerce; Rio Grande Valley Hispanic Chamber of Commerce; Rio Grande Valley Partnership; Rolling Plains Cotton Growers, Inc.; San Antonio Chamber of Commerce; San Antonio Hispanic Chamber of Commerce.

Select Milk Producers, Inc.; Sherman Chamber of Commerce; South Texas Cotton & Grain Association; South Texans' Property Rights Association; Southern Rolling Plains Cotton Growers Association; Southwest Council of Agribusiness; State Tax Group, LLC; Texas Ag Industries.

Texas Agricultural Cooperative Council; Texas Agricultural Irrigation Association; Texas Allied Poultry Association; Texas Association of Dairymen; Texas Association of Mexican American Chambers of Commerce; Texas Border Council; Texas Broiler Council; Texas Business Leadership Council.

Texas Cattle Feeders Association; Texas Corn Producers Association; Texas Cotton Ginners' Association; Texas Egg Council;

Texas Forestry Association; Texas Grain and Feed Association; Texas Grain Sorghum Association; Texas Independent Ginners Association; Texas Instruments; Texas International Produce Association.

Texas Logging Council; Texas Nursery and Landscape Association; Texas Pork Producers Association; Texas Poultry Federation; Texas Poultry Improvement Association; Texas REALTORS® Texas Rice Council; Texas Rice Producers Legislative Group; Texas Seed Trade Association; Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association.

Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association; Texas Soybean Association; Texas Turkey Federation; Texas Wheat Producers Association; The Borderplex Alliance; Texas Border Coalition; United Parcel Service of America, Inc.; United Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; United States Rice Producers Association.

United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce; United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce Houston Chapter; United States-Mexico Chamber of Commerce Southwest Chapter; Visit Fort Worth; Vocational Agriculture Teachers Association of Texas; Western Equipment Dealers Association; Western Peanut Growers Association.

DECEMBER 18, 2019.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the CEO members of Business Roundtable, I urge you to vote in favor of H.R. 5430, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act. Over 12 million American jobs depend on the \$1.4 trillion in trade with Canada and Mexico. Passing USMCA will modernize a 25-year old agreement with our neighbors and preserve and strengthen the North American economy.

USMCA includes many gold-standard provisions, further opens markets and sets standards that will benefit workers, businesses and farmers across broad industry sectors. USMCA, once in effect, will promote the digital economy and trade, remove key barriers to goods and services trade, promote the free flow of data for all sectors, enhance trade facilitation and e-commerce, and support small businesses by cutting red tape.

No trade agreement is perfect, and we do not support every individual provision in USMCA. Future agreements should include stronger intellectual property protections for life-saving innovations and technologies. Nevertheless, we strongly believe that USMCA, in its totality, will support U.S. economic growth, jobs, and innovation.

Business Roundtable appreciates the bipartisan efforts in Congress to ensure that all USMCA commitments will be fully enforceable, and we will work with Congress and the Administration through USMCA implementation to boost North American competitiveness.

Passing USMCA with broad bipartisan support will also deepen support for trade policies that help Americans compete at home and abroad. We urge you to vote Yes on USMCA.

Sincerely,

TOM LINEBARGER,
*Chairman and Chief Executive Office,
Cummins Inc. Chair, Trade and International Committee Business Roundtable.*

ITI,

PROMOTING INNOVATION WORLDWIDE,
Washington, DC, December 18, 2019.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

HON. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Republican Leader,

House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the members of the Infor-

mation Technology Industry Council (ITI), I write to express our strong support for legislation implementing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (H.R. 5430). Given the importance of this agreement to the technology sector, we will consider scoring votes in support of final passage in our 116th Congressional Voting Guide.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) represents a landmark improvement in our relationships with some of our most important trading partners from the perspective of the tech sector, and a key step forward for U.S. leadership in innovation and digital trade. Notably, the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement contains first-of-its-kind, cutting-edge digital trade provisions that recognize the reality of the 21st century economy and would boost the U.S. economy and its competitiveness around the world.

American companies of all sizes and across all industries leverage technology, and can expect to benefit from the USMCA's digital trade and other tech-focused provisions. These provisions will promote the seamless flow of data across borders, allow companies to store data where it makes the most sense from the perspective of their business and customers, prevent costly tariffs and taxes on technology products and services, safeguard source code and algorithms by prohibiting requirements that companies divulge them as a condition of doing business, promote acceptance of U.S.-developed international standards, and create consistency in testing and certification procedures for tech goods.

We applaud the work and leadership that has gone into securing the opportunity to move forward with ratification of the USMCA, and urge you and your colleagues to support the implementing legislation for the agreement when it comes to the House floor.

Sincerely,

JASON D. OXMAN,
President and CEO.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Madam Speaker, ever since President Trump struck a new, pro-American trade agreement with Canada and Mexico over a year ago, he has worked tirelessly with Members of both parties to get to the point of passing the USMCA through Congress.

Make no mistake about it: The President's leadership on this issue has put us on the brink of this tremendous accomplishment. Today, we will pass a new trade deal that will create jobs, grow our economy, and help our farmers.

Having strongly advocated for the passage of this deal, I am proud to express my strong support for USMCA and all the opportunities it will provide.

Kentucky will strongly benefit from USMCA. Estimates show that our State, alone, will see over \$260 million more in agriculture exports to Canada and Mexico. New trade markets, more stability for our farmers and manufacturers, and more accountability from our trading partners will help our people and grow our entire economy.

As a farmer and Kentucky's former commissioner of agriculture, I know firsthand the need for our country to establish new markets for our farmers. I am proud to be a strong voice for the agriculture community and represent their interests in Washington.

This is a great day for our farmers, for Kentucky, and for all of America.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, this is really a happy moment for me to acknowledge the work that the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ) did on behalf of labor rights. He stood up in the working group on behalf of the working people, and I think that he considerably shifted this argument in their direction.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GOMEZ).

(Mr. GOMEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to the United States Trade Representative.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
September 17, 2019.

Hon. ROBERT E. LIGHTHIZER,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR LIGHTHIZER: We write to express our concern regarding the inclusion of Article 20.89 in the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). This provision, entitled "Legal Remedies and Safe Harbors," mirrors Section 512 of Title 17, originally enacted by the Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998 (DMCA). In certain circumstances, Section 512 frees online platforms from liability for infringing content posted by third parties.

The effects of Section 512 and the appropriate role of a copyright safe harbor have become the subject of much attention in recent years. Some have called on Congress to update these very provisions, enacted in the days of a dial-up Internet. The U.S. Copyright Office is expected to produce a report on Section 512 around the end of this year, the result of a multi-year process that started in 2015. Moreover, the European Union has recently issued a copyright directive that includes reforms to its analogous safe harbor for online platforms, which may have an impact on the U.S. domestic policy debate.

Without taking a position on that debate in this letter, we find it problematic for the United States to export language mirroring this provision while such serious policy discussions are ongoing. For that reason, we do not believe a provision requiring parties to adopt a Section 512-style safe harbor system of the type mandated by Article 20.89 should continue to be included in future trade agreements. Given that the Judiciary Committee closely oversees Section 512 through its jurisdiction over intellectual property laws, we also hope that the Office of the United States Trade Representative will work closely with our Committee in advance of negotiating copyright issues going forward.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. We would be pleased to discuss this issue with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman.
DOUG COLLINS,
Ranking Member.

Mr. GOMEZ. Madam Speaker, the original NAFTA was a failure for working families, and the NAFTA 2.0 deal that President Trump signed in 2018 was not much better. House Democrats recognized that, and we rejected it, and we worked until we got an enforceable deal.

As a result, the final revised USMCA is much better than NAFTA 1.0, and it is even better than NAFTA 2.0. And, I would say, you can't even call it "NAFTA Lite" anymore.

Despite our work, even with the improvements that we have made, I know that this won't bring back all the jobs that we have lost here in the United States; but, over time, I hope the new labor standards and the enhanced enforcement mechanisms we negotiated will help raise wages in Mexico, reducing U.S. corporations' incentive to outsource jobs.

No trade agreement or legislation is perfect, and I do not endorse every single provision of USMCA, but I know that it is always easier to talk about a problem than to fix a problem.

When we proceed on this issue, future trade agreements must recognize that trade and globalization have pushed wages down and weakened the negotiation power of workers. This is where our focus must be.

One provision I am proud of is in labor, and that is, specifically, a new rapid-response mechanism to enforce labor standards.

This has never been written into an American trade agreement. By ensuring Mexican workers' rights are protected, we prevent a race to the bottom. For the first time ever, we have an enforceable labor standard in a trade agreement.

I thank everybody who worked on this and made sure that we are moving in the right direction.

Madam Speaker, I rise to thank Speaker Pelosi for appointing me to the Working Group tasked with renegotiating USMCA on behalf of the Democratic Caucus.

I also thank my colleagues on the Working Group, Representatives Richard Neal, Earl Blumenauer, Jan Schakowsky, Mike Thompson, Suzanne Bonamici, John Larson, Terri Sewell, and Rosa Delauro.

Additionally, I wish to recognize the efforts of the Ways and Means trade staff and personal office staff who contributed. Their names are Laura Thrift, Osaremen Okolo, Syd Terry, Jack Spasiano, Robert Nuttall, Allison Smith, Scott Stephanou, Jennifer Goedke, Samuel Negatu, Keigan Mull, Julia Friedman, Katherine White, Katherine Linton, Alexandra Whitaker, John Catalfamo, Katherine Monge and Katherine Tai.

Finally, I wish to thank Ambassador Robert Lighthizer, Ambassador C.J. Mahoney, and the rest of the professional staff at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative for their faithful engagement with House Democrats.

□ 1215

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. WAGNER).

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding. I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the USMCA trade agreement.

For months, partisan politics and the Democrats' impeachment charade have prevented us from finalizing this agreement, but it is clear to Members on

both sides of the aisle that the President has negotiated a deal that will strengthen our economy and benefit all Missourians and Americans.

One of every three rows of crops is grown for export in the great State of Missouri, and this deal expands market access in Canada and Mexico for our farmers.

It is the first time that a U.S. trade agreement is specifically addressing biotech, and the St. Louis region is the Silicon Valley for ag-tech.

USMCA also includes the Wagner language on human trafficking. I worked with Ambassador Lighthizer to guarantee that the USMCA holds my Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act, FOSTA, to help stop online sex trafficking here at home and now throughout North America.

A "yes" on the USMCA is a yes for victims, a yes for jobs, a yes for farmers, and a yes for the prosperity of all Americans.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote YES on the USMCA trade agreement. For months, partisan politics and the Democrats' impeachment charade have prevented us from finalizing this agreement. But it is clear to members on both sides of the aisle that the President has negotiated a deal that will strengthen our economy and benefit all Missourians.

One of every three rows of crops is grown for exports in the great state of Missouri, and this deal expands market access in Canada and Mexico for our farmers.

The USMCA also includes the "Wagner Language" on human trafficking. I worked with Ambassador Lighthizer to guarantee that the USMCA upholds my Fight Online Sex Trafficking Act (FOSTA) to help stop online sex trafficking here at home and now throughout North America.

A YES on the USMCA is a yes for victims, a yes for jobs, a yes for farmers, and a yes for the prosperity of all Americans. Thank you. I yield back.

This agreement also benefits Missouri's thriving ag tech community by addressing agricultural biotechnology, including new technologies such as gene editing.

This is the first time U.S. trade agreement is specifically addressing biotech, and the St. Louis region is the Silicon Valley for ag tech. The USMCA will help protect our intellectual property, and I hope it will be a standard for future trade agreements as well.

The Wagner Language allows our trading partners to enact domestic laws that enable victims to sue the websites that facilitate the sex trade and empower law enforcement to enforce criminal laws against the websites that sell women and children.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI), an important advocate of environmental issues as a member of the Trade Working Group.

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the updated United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement.

In the years that followed NAFTA's enactment in 1994, American jobs were outsourced to Mexico, and the wages and working conditions were not improved for Mexican workers. This

agreement, while not perfect, is an important opportunity to fix the damage from NAFTA and to create a new baseline for future trade agreements.

The renegotiated USMCA strengthens labor rules so that it will be easier to prove violations. It includes robust monitoring systems and strong enforcement tools, including people on the ground in Mexico to monitor compliance.

Importantly, the updated USMCA no longer includes harmful provisions that would have locked in high drug prices and made it more difficult for patients to access affordable generic drugs.

This final agreement also makes important advancements to protect our environment. It improves environmental rules, puts them in the text of the agreement, provides a path to reducing hydrofluorocarbon emissions, protects against overfishing, makes it easier to prove environmental violations, and secures more than \$600 million to implement the environmental provisions and address pollution and marine debris.

Throughout the negotiation process, I fought hard for the inclusion of strong climate provisions. I am disappointed that the Trump administration rejected our efforts. We did, however, include a clause that creates a path for adding additional environmental and conservation agreements in the future. I will continue to do all I can to pass and implement bold policies to combat climate change.

The USMCA is significantly better than the agreement that the Trump administration brought to us. It is a major improvement over the NAFTA rules that are currently in place. It will bring more certainty to workers, to Oregonians, and for the environment.

I thank Speaker PELOSI for appointing me to the working group and the hardworking staff that got us to today.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), who has been a longtime leader in agriculture, on the farm bill, and frankly, we couldn't have gotten this agreement done without him.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Texas for yielding. I am certainly glad this day has finally arrived and to stand with American farmers by passing the USMCA.

For the last year, Democrats obsessed over a partisan impeachment process while President Trump remained focused on securing the wins that American farmers were counting on.

For our farm families, passing USMCA means an annual increase of \$2.2 billion in agriculture exports. It also means we gain about 176,000 quality jobs for Americans. The USMCA resets our trading relationships with Mexico and Canada, improves our farmers' market access to these two important trading partners, and strips away nontariff barriers that prevent free and fair trade.

I commend President Trump, Ambassador Lighthizer, and Ambassador Doud for their tireless work on this agreement, in all its stages. Our farmers and ranchers were counting on them, and they delivered.

The near-universal support in the agricultural community for USMCA speaks volumes about the importance of this trade deal. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting America's farmers and ranchers by voting to pass the USMCA.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a formidable negotiator and a very important member of the Trade Working Group.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement, the first trade agreement I have ever voted for in my more than 20 years in Congress.

I am proud to be on the working group that helped negotiate this agreement, and I thank the chairman of that group, RICHIE NEAL.

It is far better than the original NAFTA, and it is far better than the deeply flawed trade agreement that President Trump handed to us.

For example, he tried to tuck into it a huge gift to Big Pharma that would have raised the cost of medicine throughout our hemisphere. But from day one, I insisted that that provision be removed. Today, it is gone.

Without the work of the working group, without the help of the Speaker of the House, without Rich Trumka, the president of the AFL-CIO, we would not be voting on this today.

Is it a perfect thing? No, it is not. For example, there is a big gift to Big Tech provided in this called section 230, which gives a liability shield for all the companies and the platforms, for all the content that they have on those platforms.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to Ambassador Lighthizer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, August 6, 2019.

Hon. ROBERT E. LIGHTHIZER,
U.S. Trade Representative,
Washington, DC.

DEAR AMBASSADOR LIGHTHIZER: We write to express our concern regarding the inclusion of Article 19.17 in the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA).

In many respects, the language of Article 19.17 mirrors that of Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act. Section 230 shields online platforms from some of the liability associated with third-party content posted on those platforms.

As you may know, the effects of Section 230 and the appropriate role of such a liability shield have become the subject of much debate in recent years. While we take no view on that debate in this letter, we find it inappropriate for the United States to export language mirroring Section 230 while such serious policy discussions are ongoing. For that reason, we do not believe any provision regarding intermediary liability protections of the type created by Article 19.17 are ripe for inclusion in any trade deal going forward. Given that our Committee closely oversees

Section 230 and all portions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, we also hope in the future the Office of the United States Trade Representative will consult our committee in advance of negotiating on these issues.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE,
Chairman.
GREG WALDEN,
Ranking Member.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, I urge everyone to vote for the trade agreement.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BALDERSON).

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BRADY for yielding. I rise this afternoon with enthusiasm for a bipartisan agreement, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA.

This trade deal between our country and our top two trading partners will be a major win for the Buckeye State. Ohio farmers and manufacturers already export nearly \$28 billion worth of goods to Canada and Mexico every year. The USMCA opens up Canada's market to American poultry and dairy so that Ohio farmers can now trade these products across international lines.

In this digital era, many people's shopping is increasingly done online. People can shop small businesses and larger companies alike, especially during the holiday gifting season. USMCA brings an outdated trade agreement into the 21st century with a previously nonexistent section on digital trade.

USMCA is what our country needs now, and I am thrilled to support this bipartisan agreement's passage. I thank Chairman NEAL and Ranking Member BRADY.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a formidable negotiator, a great friend, and, I must say, an invaluable member of the working group that helped assemble this document.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I was honored to be appointed to the Speaker's working group charged with renegotiating the deeply flawed NAFTA agreement that the President signed in 2018. It enshrined the failed status quo that had hurt American workers while extending monopoly protections for pharmaceutical companies that would lock in high medicine prices.

I was focused on crafting effective and meaningful standards to protect labor rights, constructing an enforcement mechanism for the U.S. and Mexico, strengthening and protecting environmental standards, and protecting access to affordable medicines.

I was pleased the principles we presented to and, in many instances, forced on the USTR are reflected in the final agreement. Our gains include a labor-specific enforcement mechanism

for new labor standards, a review body to ensure Mexico is meeting its obligations, penalties for goods and services not produced in compliance, and robust resources for monitoring and enforcement.

Despite the President's rhetoric, this agreement will not bring back U.S. manufacturing jobs or undo the damage of outsourcing provisions in the Republican tax law. Despite our best efforts, it lacks more robust climate standards, labor and environmental terms, and protections for food and product safety. So, it is not the model for the future.

Wage stagnation in America is not the inevitable result of globalization and technology. Special interests have shaped government policies that have held down wages and increased inequality.

Nobel-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz said: "Inequality is not inevitable. It is a choice we make."

We made progress on this agreement. It is a framework to build on. I support the agreement and pledge to continue our work addressing globalization and trade policy.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, after nearly 400 days since President Trump signed the agreement, we are finally voting on USMCA to deliver real results for the people who make up the backbone of the American economy. This includes our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and each and every American family who depends on these industries.

USMCA will bring more than \$68 billion in new economic activity, 176,000 new jobs here at home, and an increase of \$2 billion a year annually in agricultural exports. These numbers don't lie, and that is only the beginning. Passing USMCA is a big win for the American economy.

Lastly, I can't talk about USMCA without mentioning how big of a win it is for American agriculture, particularly our dairy farmers. Under this agreement, our dairy producers will no longer be subject to Canada's class 6 and class 7 milk pricing programs, policies that have unfairly limited our export potential for years.

Madam Speaker, USMCA is a good agreement. It is a fair agreement, and it is a bipartisan agreement. I am pleased that we are finally voting on this crucial piece of policy and that we can deliver on this promise. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR), a real champion of this agreement.

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I support the USMCA, NAFTA 2.1, because we are doing this in a bipartisan way.

I thank Speaker PELOSI and the working group and Chairman NEAL and his staff for working so hard; my Texas

colleague KEVIN BRADY and his staff for working so hard; Ambassador Lighthizer and our friends to the south, the Mexicans, for working together.

My district is the epicenter of trade between the U.S. and Mexico. My city of Laredo handles 14,000 to 16,000 trailers every single day. The Laredo customs district handles 60 percent of all the trade between the U.S. and Mexico.

That means more than \$1.7 billion of goods flow between the U.S. and Mexico every day. That is over \$1 million every single minute. Trade is good. It means jobs, jobs, jobs.

I thank the committee for adding the signature environmental safeguard, the North American Development Bank. That is total, with the EPA, over \$500 million for drinking water and for waste treatment plants.

Members, pass USMCA. It means one thing: jobs, jobs, jobs.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF), the State that helped win Texas' independence.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I thank Ranking Member BRADY for yielding. I thank Ranking Member BRADY and Chairman NEAL for their hard work on this agreement.

We know that the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement is vital to our Nation's economy and my home State of Tennessee. Over 200,000 jobs in Tennessee depend on the passage of USMCA, and that includes about 35,000 manufacturing jobs and 10,000 west Tennessee farm operations.

Madam Speaker, the Volunteer State produces almost \$14 billion in exports to Canada and Mexico. More importantly, the USMCA updates the 25-year-old trade agreement that we know as NAFTA and modernizes the economic partnership of North America. Frankly, the USMCA will allow Tennessee and our Nation as a whole to achieve greater prosperity.

I thank President Trump for delivering on his promises and creating a better trade agreement for the American people.

□ 1230

Madam Speaker, I look forward to voting "yes" on the USMCA, and I urge all my colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. KENDRA S. HORN), a real champion of agriculture and small business.

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the passage of the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement.

I am proud to support this bipartisan agreement that strengthens trade and is good for both economic growth opportunities and for our workers.

A stronger trading relationship with Mexico and Canada is good for a stronger economy for Oklahoma. These

two countries are already the Sooner State's largest trading partners, accounting for \$2.4 billion in Oklahoma exports in the last year alone.

This newly-agreed-to USMCA is a monumental step in strengthening this trading relationship. This agreement not only ensures fair trade for Oklahoma businesses and workers—who continue to create world-class products—by guaranteeing that exports that enter Canada and Mexico are all tariff-free, but it also gives Congress the necessary tools of enforcement to combat the high cost of prescription drugs and is good for our workers.

This strongly improves labor standards, as well as allowing workers to compete on a level playing field.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this USMCA and other bipartisan solutions.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL), a gentleman who was pro trade and pro USMCA the moment that he hit Congress.

Mr. MITCHELL. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. BRADY for being such a leader on this.

I saw the impact of NAFTA on my State of Michigan, on my community, and my family. Jobs disappeared at an astounding rate, including my dad's job working an assembly line at an auto plant. I saw the unfair treatment of farmers trying to export their products.

I live in a district with a major border crossing to Canada, the Blue Water Bridge. So I also saw the importance of trade with our neighbors. But trade must be fair, balanced, and not disadvantage hardworking American families.

NAFTA failed miserably at that.

USMCA is a massive improvement over NAFTA in more ways than time allows me to detail.

America needs the USMCA. We need it now. So let's finish this drawn-out process, pass the bill, and urge the Senate to proceed with speed.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON).

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement is essential to creating new jobs and strengthening the economy of my home State of Arizona.

Those of us in border States understand the value of trading with our neighbors, and I can tell you, growing trade relationships with Mexico and Canada is essential to Arizona. This new agreement will offer a big lift to our local companies.

Already in Arizona, nearly 230,000 jobs rely on across-the-border commerce. That means 230,000 paychecks buying holiday gifts, 230,000 paychecks putting food on the table for their families, and 230,000 paychecks contributing to our State's economy.

Today we have a real opportunity for job creators, from multi-national companies, to mid-size and small businesses, from tech workers to farmworkers. There is no doubt that the new USMCA is a win for all Arizonans.

This is a bipartisan agreement. It sets a new standard for creating trade rules that are enforceable, good for American workers, and effectively consider how business is done in the 21st century.

Importantly, it reasserts Congress' role in trade policy.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL and the trade working group for their hard work in getting this deal done.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), whose district has a long border with Mexico and who was deeply engaged in the negotiating rounds with Mexico, Canada, and the U.S., my friend from San Antonio.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Madam Speaker, why should all Americans care about free trade with Mexico and Canada?

We should care about the USMCA because just about every aspect of our lives, the food on our table, the clothes on our backs, the fuel in our cars, depends on free trade with Mexico and Canada.

We should care about USMCA because 14 million jobs across the Nation, including the jobs of over half of my constituents in south Texas, depend on free trade with Mexico and Canada.

We should care about USMCA because we live in a world where U.S. military and economic dominance is no longer guaranteed, and a strong North America is essential for us to remain competitive as China tries to replace America as the most important economy in the world.

So let's get the USMCA to the President's desk so we can start talking about increasing North American competitiveness in the rest of the world.

I support this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Ms. SPANBERGER), a courageous congresswoman.

Ms. SPANBERGER. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5430.

Last year, Virginia exported \$4.3 billion worth of goods to Canada and Mexico. One out of six Virginia manufacturers exports to these two countries, and of these firms, 64 percent are small- or medium-sized businesses.

These businesses are the backbone of our economy, and today they are looking to Congress to take this vital step towards securing long-term trade stability.

Earlier this month, I made that point clear at a meeting with the vice president. During our discussion, I underscored the USMCA's potential to stimulate growth across the Seventh District of Virginia.

For central Virginia businesses, today's vote is a welcome step forward

towards modernizing NAFTA and staying competitive in the 21st century.

For Virginia's crop and livestock producers, today's vote means protecting and expanding relationships with critical buyers in Canada and Mexico.

And for central Virginia's workers, today's vote carries with it a commitment from our trading partners to live up to their labor commitments.

I know that central Virginia's economy and the hardworking men and women who spur it forward have waited patiently for this day to arrive.

Madam Speaker, I thank everyone for their work on this: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member, Ambassador Lighthizer, and my colleagues on the working group.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support USMCA.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, this week represented the best of times and the worst of times.

Yesterday displayed the worst of times by impeaching the President for political reasons and reversing the will of 63 million Americans.

Today, however, represents the best of times by finally voting to approve the USMCA.

This historic agreement, which has been held up by Speaker PELOSI for over a year, will bring 176,000 new jobs and spur \$68 billion in new economic activity. It removes trade barriers for our ag products, creating new markets for our farmers and helping rural America as a result.

Encouragingly, the auto industry will benefit as well. Just last week, General Motors announced that it would be investing over \$1 billion in a truck plant in my home State of Missouri due to the USMCA.

This agreement moves our relationship with Mexico and Canada into the 21st century, and will benefit the American farmer, the American worker, and the American consumer.

I applaud President Trump for delivering on this historic trade agreement.

I look forward to voting "yes" on the USMCA and bringing more jobs to our great country.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement and also to sound the alarm of an issue that should concern us all: violence.

To put things in perspective, since 2006, Mexico has lost as many people to homicide as the United States has lost in every war since Korea.

Just in the last 3 years, the number of homicides exceeded the number of soldiers lost in Korea and Vietnam combined, all while we act as if nothing is happening in our own backyard.

Negotiators worked tirelessly to get us here to today's vote, but they failed

to acknowledge the single greatest threat to North American trade and prosperity: violence.

I rise today to say that we have missed an opportunity, and I cannot be silent and will not let this go.

Mexican President Lopez Obrador ran on a promise to achieve peace, end the war on drugs, and create a new civilian national guard to tackle organized crime by fighting poverty.

While I have no doubt of his good intentions, he has failed miserably. Mexico's crime rate continues to rise; the endemic mass murders, disappearances, extortions, and assaults in Mexico show no signs of slowing.

Madam Speaker, by accepting this as the status quo and staying silent, we risk standing in the way of our own economic success.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), a champion of agriculture.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, and perhaps one of the most successful in modern time.

I am looking at this USMCA trade agreement. I said from the beginning that I would not have opened up NAFTA; it was good for Iowa agriculture, it was good for Iowa manufacturing, it was good for America in many areas. But the President promised that he would open it up and that he would prevail in his negotiations.

He has followed through and he has kept his word.

For a year and a half I have been having discussions with every entity that I can find that has been affected by this trade agreement. They all say, We are better off. They might say, We are marginally better off, but they say, We are better off, until you get to dairy, where we are a lot, lot better off than we were in the past.

This is a terrific trade agreement.

Whatever the nuances were afterwards where there were some changes that didn't affect, I don't think, the district that I represent, what this amounts to is this: It is a huge victory for the President of the United States, for Americans everywhere, for Iowans in the Fourth Congressional District, which is the number one agriculture producing district in all of America.

We are happy. We are delighted. We are thankful to have this Christmas present coming to us.

We say, Merry Christmas, Mr. President; Merry Christmas, America.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED), a courageous congressman.

Mr. ALLRED. Madam Speaker, I rise to applaud the work of my colleagues in both parties on reaching a bipartisan consensus on a trade agreement between the U.S., Mexico, and Canada.

I know that this was no easy task, and today we are poised to pass this historic agreement.

This was a priority for me, and I worked tirelessly to ensure that the administration, my colleagues, and House leaders knew how important this was for Texas.

For Texans, trade with Mexico and Canada isn't just a textbook exercise or abstract policy issue; it is real jobs for more than 36,000 Texans in my district.

Businesses across north Texas rely on supply chains between our three nations to manufacture, distribute, and sell goods and services. We must give them certainty and stability.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes." This job-creating agreement will shift the trade paradigm and create a new standard for trade that will protect workers and the environment both here at home and across the North American continent.

Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL and the working group and Ambassador Lighthizer for their work on getting this across the line.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HUIZENGA), a leader of ag and autos.

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement negotiated by President Trump and his team, as well as the strong leadership here in the House.

For more than a year, I have called on Speaker PELOSI to have this vote on this trade agreement. I am glad the day has arrived.

The stakes for Michigan are extremely high. One estimate is 38.9 percent of Michigan's total GDP depends on trade, the highest in the Nation. A staggering 65 percent of the State's exports are bound for Canada and Mexico.

Trade with our Nation's neighbors support more than 338,000 Michigan jobs.

Ratifying the USMCA will lead to more than \$30 billion in investment in new automotive manufacturing in the U.S. and create more than 75,000 jobs for American auto workers.

Passing the USMCA is also vitally important to our agricultural community. Michigan's food and agricultural exports total approximately \$1.98 billion annually and support roughly 805,000 food and agricultural jobs.

This agreement will level the playing field for our farmers, growers, and producers, and expand market access for commodities such as dairy goods, poultry, and eggs.

This is a win for Michigan workers, farmers, and job creators, and I support this bill.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. CRAIG), who I can assure everybody was an assertive advocate for this agreement.

□ 1245

Ms. CRAIG. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of USMCA.

This trade agreement is a win for Minnesota's family farmers and small

business owners. It protects American workers and creates certainty and new opportunity moving forward with our largest trading partners.

I have walked on farms across my district with the families who feed, clothe, and fuel this country. One thing is clear: Years of tough prices, severe weather, and trade issues have taken their toll. They need this trade agreement now.

I am proud to have worked to eliminate the handouts to Big Pharma from the original draft. My commitment is to work with this administration when it benefits our community and stand up to them when it doesn't.

This is a good deal for American farmers, workers, and businesses. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this important trade agreement.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DESJARLAIS).

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement that will replace the outdated North American Free Trade Agreement.

USMCA opens new markets for American agriculture in Canada, returns manufacturing jobs outsourced to Mexico to our own country, and is the first U.S. trade deal to focus on cross-border commerce for small businesses, easing rules and regulations to level the playing field for startups and entrepreneurs.

Our economy is already strong. Jobs and income are growing, especially for working and middle-class Americans. My home State of Tennessee is a manufacturing and transportation hub, and small business jobs and wage growth there lead the Nation. The USMCA will further strengthen our economy.

However, the President's opposition, who just yesterday voted to impeach him, have for years obstructed the agenda my constituents, as well as Democrats and Republicans around the country, supported in 2016.

We have succeeded, despite unrelenting resistance. Donald Trump has shown courage and determination that has resulted in a pending trade deal with China. Combined with tax cuts, reduced regulations, and American energy independence, these trade deals and others the President has produced will continue our remarkable economic progress, as well as strengthen national security.

I am proud to support the USMCA for Tennessee farmers, manufacturers, and small businesses.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS), a ferocious advocate.

Ms. STEVENS. Madam Speaker, today, we rise to pass a trade deal for the middle class. Today, we rise to strengthen the protections for the workers. Today is a great day, for today, we are standing up for our manufacturers and our manufacturing economy.

To all the suppliers in my district who advocated, who reached out, who asked for the certainty for their workforce, for the investment, today, we are getting something done for you. We do not say Republican or Democrat, but we say manufacturing. We say hoorah for the middle class, for the growth and the expansion for our middle class.

We came here to champion our manufacturing economy. We came here to get something done, to reach a compromise, to shed the awful effects of the original NAFTA, and to deliver yet again for people. That is what we are here for in our majority.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, today has been a long time coming for President Trump, the American people, and the American farmers and ranchers.

Our vote today ensures that we deliver on our promise to bring fair and equitable trade with our closest trading partners, Mexico and Canada.

In my home State of Washington, exports to Canada and Mexico totaled \$11.3 billion in 2018, and trade-related jobs amount to nearly 40 percent of all jobs in the State.

I have heard from farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers in every county of central Washington. They all agree that today's vote to pass USMCA is exactly what we need.

Most importantly, USMCA maintains duty-free access for U.S. agriculture products, including the iconic Washington State apple, which accounts for nearly \$450 million in exports annually.

The USMCA goes even further to advance access for the U.S. dairy and wine industries, two substantial drivers for Washington's economy.

Madam Speaker, I am proud today that we are delivering USMCA for my constituents.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the very capable gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. TORRES SMALL), who once even followed me into the coffee shop to advocate on behalf of this agreement.

Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico. Madam Speaker, I thank President Trump, congressional leadership, Chairman NEAL, Ranking Member BRADY, and members of the USMCA working group for fighting to make significant improvements to the out-of-date NAFTA agreement.

This is a win for New Mexico's workers, small businesses, agricultural producers, and our economy as a whole.

In my conversations with constituents from across southern New Mexico, I have seen just why NAFTA is out of date and why USMCA will be a better deal.

Dairy producers in Belen and Roswell have talked with me about how, even when New Mexican dairies aren't selling directly to Canada, increased market access and new pricing will raise commodity prices across the country.

USMCA makes significant progress in protecting American workers by evening the playing field with meaningful enforcement mechanisms that will protect hard-won improvements.

Other New Mexicans, like our world-famous New Mexico chili and pecan growers, now have the certainty of a trade deal.

New Mexico stands to gain real benefits after we pass USMCA today.

Like any deal, it isn't perfect. Environment and enforcement standards can always be improved. But the USMCA is entirely necessary for New Mexico's producers, workers, and consumers.

This deal will deliver for New Mexico. It shows that compromise can be made, that we can put politics aside.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of USMCA.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the USMCA but also to raise a concern about the inclusion of section 230 language of the Communications Decency Act.

This act gives broad legal immunity to Big Tech, which, in turn, uses it as a shield from accountability. It is important that this provision is not—I state “not”—included in future trade agreements.

The behavior of Big Tech has been the subject of substantial scrutiny. Much of this scrutiny revolves around the appropriateness of maintaining this immunity clause.

On a daily basis, new concerns are raised about section 230, including illegal drug sales, child exploitation, terrorist recruitment, political bias, revenge porn, deepfakes, and many more. Section 230 has played a significant role.

When Speaker PELOSI and I agree on an issue, there is some there there.

I encourage my colleagues to support the USMCA but again raise the issue about section 230. Its continued merit on how it would apply to both trade agreements and everyday application demand modification due to its lack of accountability.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. AXNE). I can assure the people of Iowa that she advocated on behalf of this agreement.

Mrs. AXNE. Madam Speaker, today, a lot of hard work is paying off with the passage of USMCA.

I thank my colleagues who crafted this agreement that gives market stability to farmers, protects Iowa workers from having their wages undercut, and helps reduce the high cost of biologic drugs. It even has important environmental protections.

I know my farmers, producers, and agriculture workers are celebrating the passage of USMCA today.

Everywhere I go, the message has been clear: We need USMCA because of uncertainty in our markets.

We now have that deal.

The House has done a great job, but the Senate already said they won't take up this agreement anytime soon.

It will pass today with bipartisan support. Whenever the Senate chooses to bring it up, it will pass with bipartisan support then, as well. The same Senators who have blamed the House for not moving this forward quickly enough are now stopping the USMCA from becoming law.

Iowans and Americans are asking for help, and we must get this deal done.

I am proud to have fought for a better trade agreement that works for Iowa, and I encourage those of us to vote for it in the House and for the Senate to take it up for a vote to make life better for people across the country.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement. While I am glad we are here today, this moment is long overdue.

While Democrats have been focusing on impeaching President Trump, manufacturers and family farmers in Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District have been waiting for the trade deal to be ratified. That is because this trade deal means a lot to the hardworking people and farmers of Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District.

Just take the positive effect the USMCA will have on Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District farmers. Pennsylvania's 12th Congressional District is home to more than 10,500 farms, 98 percent of which are family farms. Moreover, our district is responsible for 18 percent of Pennsylvania's agriculture products.

The provisions in this deal eliminating Canada's class 7 milk pricing program, increasing corn and soybean exports, and many other improvements will make a huge difference for those family farms.

More important is the leverage that gives the United States when negotiating additional trade deals.

It is no surprise that when Speaker PELOSI agreed to the USMCA, China agreed to the Phase One trade deal that President Trump had been negotiating for the benefit of our country.

Again, USMCA is long overdue, but I am glad we are finally here to be able to support America in this trade deal.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I am glad to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), who is an assertive advocate of USMCA.

Mr. COSTA. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize all the hard work it took to reach this agreement for the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement: Chairman NEAL, Chairman BRADY, Chairman BLUMENAUER, the good work of Ambassador Lighthizer, the working groups the Speaker put together, and

the Speaker's desire to see this get across the finish line.

It is important to update NAFTA for the sake of the American workers and our agricultural economy.

This agreement will improve opportunities for good-paying jobs in America by updating labor protections and standards in Mexico that can be enforced.

The agreement goes a long way to improve environmental standards and clean up cross-border pollution between California and Mexico and other border

With nearly half of California's agricultural products destined for foreign markets, the certainty this deal brings to relations between our two largest trading partners, Canada and Mexico, cannot be overstated.

I was glad to be a part of this bipartisan effort to bring people together for today's vote.

I congratulate the President. The fact of the matter is, this is good for America, good for working people, and good for agriculture.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to supporting USMCA, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HAGEDORN).

Mr. HAGEDORN. Madam Speaker, after advocating for USMCA this past year, I am excited to vote for it today.

Not only will this deal expand trade with Mexico and Canada, but it is going to help us build momentum for deals with other nations, like China, Vietnam, and so forth. It is going to be great for our country.

One quick example of how this helps the American people, particularly farm families: Over the summer, Farmers for Free Trade rallied in our southern Minnesota district for USMCA. We were at the Hoffman Dairy Farm, about 15 miles south of New Ulm. The Hoffmans are sixth-generation dairy farms. They said that it has been 5 or 6 years of tough commodity prices—low prices, high input cost. They needed a win.

Our market for dairy has been shut out of Canada, virtually, with 300 percent tariffs. USMCA is going to knock down those tariffs, allow more exports, create more demand, help families like the Hoffmans, and help our country. I urge everyone to vote for the agreement.

Madam Speaker, as the first member of Minnesota's congressional delegation to support the USMCA, I am thrilled to finally have the opportunity to vote for the implementation of this agreement.

The USMCA is a long overdue, much needed and well-deserved bipartisan win for the American people. The agreement is a win for our workers, businesses, farmers and families in Minnesota's First District and throughout the nation.

It will open new markets, expand economic opportunity and create new high-wage jobs,

build momentum for trade deals with China and other nations, and help protect and promote our rural way of life in southern Minnesota.

We are already seeing evidence of this momentum with the United States and China announcing a “Phase One” trade agreement just days after the bipartisan agreement on USMCA was reached.

I am personally hearing from the farmers back home that they are relieved to finally have some market certainty after six years of low commodity prices. Especially our dairy farmers, who for the first time will have access to the Canadian market.

USMCA is also a boon to manufacturers who will continue to have duty-free access to Canada and Mexico, the industry’s largest export markets—creating tens of thousands of new jobs and adding nearly \$70 billion to the U.S. economy as a whole.

I will vote “yes” on this agreement, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same, and I hope the Senate will move quickly to ratify the deal and send it to President Trump’s desk so that the agreement can be implemented as quickly as possible for the American people.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), and I want to recognize the critical role that he played in getting us to this bipartisan negotiation of USMCA.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, today, I am proud to rise in support of USMCA.

As the Representative of South Carolina’s Lowcountry, which is home to the Port of Charleston, Volvo, Bosch, JW Aluminum, Becton Dickinson, and countless other manufacturers, I know just how important market stability and trade certainty is to my constituents.

I promised the people of the Lowcountry I would come to Washington to work with Democrats and Republicans in Congress, the White House, and anyone else necessary to find bipartisan, commonsense solutions to issues impacting our district. Passage of USMCA is a major step in that direction.

□ 1300

Nearly 30,000 jobs in our district are supported by trade with Mexico and Canada. This agreement is absolutely critical to maintaining good-paying jobs and economic growth in the Lowcountry.

I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of the USMCA to bolster America’s economy, support workers, and protect the environment.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), my friend, a leader of trade policy in the George H.W. Bush administration.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the USMCA, and I want to congratulate my friends, Mr. BRADY from Texas and Mr. NEAL, for their leadership in the

House Ways and Means Committee. It is a great victory for their hard work and perseverance.

As a member of the USMCA Republican House Whip Team, I was proud to advocate on behalf of this much-needed update to NAFTA.

Twenty-seven years ago, I worked for President Bush 41 and worked on supporting his goal of North America becoming the world’s premier economic market. How pleased he would be to be here today and see this bipartisan support to update the North American trade market for a new generation.

Impressive, indeed. We will take converts to free trade every day, even if some of them are overnight converts.

The Senate must act expeditiously now to convert this dream to a reality and benefit the 100,000 Arkansans who live and die by trade with Canada and Mexico.

Congratulations to President Trump and Ambassador Lighthizer on this historic victory, and Happy New Year to the economic region in North America.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), a well-regarded Congresswoman whose district I have visited.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Chairman NEAL for yielding me the time.

In my congressional district, I represent more than 9,600 family farms and 90,000 labor households. I have toured my district many times and was fortunate enough to bring the Speaker of the House into the State of Illinois over the summer to meet with our family farmers.

Trade is one of the top issues people back home bring up to me, and the message that they deliver is loud and clear: We need a strong trade deal with broad-based support to help both America’s farmers and our labor communities.

I have worked to help bring parties to the table and reach a deal that works for everyone. I am proud to say that the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement is that deal.

The USMCA outlines protections for labor that will make America better prepared to expand opportunities for our workforce. It builds on trade relationships critical to our agriculture markets, and it represents the strongest trade enforcement mechanisms our country has ever seen.

I am proud to cast my vote to support this step forward and to help build the foundation for future trade agreements.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), an agriculture leader from the Mount Rushmore State.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, so often in this political environment, victories bring with them a winner, but many more losers. Today is different. Today is a celebration. Today brings with it a bounty of benefits to a multitude of winners.

If you are a dairy family, today you are a winner.

If you are a middle-class family, today you are a winner.

If you grow wheat, if you write code, if you process cheese, you are a winner today.

So often in this Chamber we lament deals that could have been, but today is a deal we are celebrating, with \$2 billion of new agriculture exports, with 176,000 new jobs, with \$68 billion of real growth in this economy.

Madam Speaker, today, 300 million Americans are winners.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a very good friend of mine.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

I rise in opposition to NAFTA 2, which has been rebranded the USMCA.

First of all, it is being rushed through at the last moments of this session without the majority of Members even able to read it or participate in hearings on it.

Number two, it will not stem the continental outsourcing of U.S. jobs, and, sadly, and most importantly, it will not achieve the real enforcement by the Governments of Mexico or the United States.

For over 10 years, I have been trying to get the Government of Mexico to arrest and prosecute the brutal murderers of Santiago Cruz, a Mexican national fighting against the huge continental labor trafficking of his countrymen. He was educating his fellow farmworkers that they did not have to pay a bounty of \$8,000 to come to this country to work in our fields as they became indentured workers.

Despite my over 10 years of efforts to bring justice to his brutal killers, Mexico behaves as if this crime never occurred. Why should I believe Mexico will enforce anything?

Furthermore, about a month ago, we saw the President of Mexico not able to keep control of his own streets, and he released the son of El Chapo, the drug lord. What makes you think this administration or the one in Mexico will do anything to enforce the laws that USMCA purports to support?

I urge all of my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Madam Speaker, for several months now, I have been very vocal about the importance of passing the USMCA for Indiana. I have heard from constituents about their desire to get this deal done. I have also encouraged my colleagues to push for a vote.

So I applaud the leadership to get this historic deal accomplished. Today’s passage of USMCA will give businesses and farmers across our district increased opportunity to grow.

In 2018, our State exported more than \$18 billion to Mexico and Canada. Under USMCA, that number will rise.

This trade deal is a big win for our automotive industry and agricultural community and for the protection of our intellectual property. With this improved trade agreement, we will see better market access and job growth here at home.

I am proud to support the passage of USMCA and look forward to supporting more victories for the U.S. economy.

Mr. NEAL. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BRINDISI), a very accomplished gentleman.

Mr. BRINDISI. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for yielding and thank him for his work and the work of the Trade Working Group for their tireless effort to get this deal done.

I rise today in strong support of this legislation and for swift approval of USMCA.

We need to make sure that New York's workers, farmers, and small businesses have a fair shot at success. That is why I worked hard with Members on both sides of the aisle and the administration to get this deal to the finish line.

There are many reasons to support this agreement, such as stronger labor and environmental standards, but I will use my brief time to highlight the impact this will have on upstate New York's dairy farmers.

I have heard from dairy farmers across upstate New York about the need to get more milk to market, boost milk prices, and crack down on unfair Canadian price supports, which USMCA will do.

USMCA will help family farms, help manufacturers, and protect workers, and I urge swift passage of this agreement.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. DAVIDSON), a manufacturing champion.

Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

It is an honor to stand in support of the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement.

Trade is a vital part of our economy. It has made America the world's land of opportunity. We have been a vital part of the world's economy.

Certainty is needed in trade right now. This deal certainly isn't perfect, but far too often here in Congress we let perfect become the enemy of good.

Frankly, we have a choice between no NAFTA, NAFTA, or an improved NAFTA, so it is not a hard multiple choice test. It is an improvement, and I look forward to continuing to work to advance the cause of capitalism and free trade in the United States of America.

Opportunities are going to make things better for Ohio's Eighth District, from manufacturing to agriculture, to financial services, and I thank everyone who has had a hand in making this come to fruition.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS), a very capable Congresswoman.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman NEAL for yielding.

Trade negotiations are not for the faint of heart. Few votes have generated more passion in this Chamber than votes on trade agreements. That is why I am so glad that we finally have an agreement that Members from both sides of the aisle can support.

It is no secret why that is. This is an agreement that sets up, for the first time, facility-level inspections to make sure that workers' rights are being honored, and it removes the onerous IP provisions that have made their way into far too many trade agreements in recent years.

Finally, as a Member from the San Diego region, it is important to have an agreement like this that both preserves and improves the binational partnership that defines the larger community.

This agreement lays the groundwork for the Federal Government to finally address the longstanding pollution flowing from the Tijuana River into San Diego Bay, which impacts both the health of our community and our military.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL), a very capable Member of the House.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for all of his hard work on getting us here today.

We have to be honest: This trade deal won't undo the deep damage NAFTA 1.0 has done to our American workers, American manufacturing, and our environment. Today, factories sit empty in Michigan and across my district, while workers are unable to compete with subpar nonunion workers in other countries.

A new trade agreement is not just going to uproot those factories from overseas and bring them back home, but we fought hard to improve the original deal because what the Trump administration first proposed wasn't enough. Democrats fought for stronger labor and environmental standards and tougher enforcement mechanisms.

This agreement has earned my vote because of the significant improvements made over the last year in NAFTA 1.0, but our work is still there to strengthen American manufacturing, protect our environment, invest in our workers, and make sure we keep America at the forefront of innovation and technology.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DELGADO), a very capable Congressman and my neighbor.

Mr. DELGADO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

My district, New York's 19th Congressional District, is home to nearly 5,000 farms. These are not large or corporate operations. They are small family farms passed down from one generation to the next.

These family farmers across my district—dairy, organic, vegetable, and diversified farmers—are being squeezed by market consolidation, lower prices, and unfavorable conditions during this downturn in the farm economy.

Today, the House has an opportunity to provide a long-overdue tool for their success—in a word, stability. The USMCA will maintain and, in some cases, increase, for our farmers, access to critical markets in Canada and Mexico.

I will cast my vote to ratify this important agreement with strength and protections for American workers and organized labor, as well as facility-specific enforcement mechanisms for these new terms.

I will close with a reminder.

This is not a panacea. Our small farmers are facing significant headwinds, and it is our duty, as a body, to support this time-honored tradition in upstate New York and across our country.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), my friend.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding.

The threshold question for any NAFTA replacement must be whether it will finally stop the outflow of American jobs and raise the standard of living for Mexican, Canadian, and, of course, American workers.

My Democratic colleagues have worked tirelessly to ensure NAFTA's replacement leads to positive change, and I thank them for their efforts which have improved the deal President Trump originally negotiated.

But these improvements will not be enough to overhaul the entrenched system in Mexico that denies workers their rights, keeps wages unconscionably low, and, consequently, incentivizes companies to ship jobs to Mexico.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRINDISI). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Michigan an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. It incentivizes companies to ship jobs to Mexico and out of our communities like mine in southeast Michigan.

Mexico has not demonstrated the will, meaningfully, to reform its labor system, and the weakness of USMCA's enforcement mechanisms mean that we will not be able to hold Mexico's feet to the fire when promised reforms do not occur.

I genuinely hope I am wrong about this, but I fear we can expect the USMCA will perpetuate the harms of

NAFTA for Mexican and American workers alike; therefore, I oppose this legislation.

□ 1315

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Mrs. FLETCHER), who is very capable.

Mrs. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this USMCA agreement. In my home State of Texas, trade with Mexico and Canada accounts for billions of dollars and millions of jobs, many of them at the Port of Houston and in the greater Houston area.

The USMCA modernizes the framework for our trade, strengthening enforcement, labor, and environmental provisions in an updated agreement that does not adversely impact our businesses, our workers, or our environment.

It is also critical for our energy future, codifying a new zero-tariff policy and further encouraging U.S. energy exports across North America for years to come.

The agreement represents a true bipartisan accomplishment that will set the standard for future trade agreements.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NEAL, the working group, Ranking Member BRADY, and Ambassador Lighthizer for their work. As cochair of the New Democrat Coalition Trade Task Force, I have been actively working with them to advance this agreement all year. I am so glad to see it come to the floor of the House. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes".

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, Texas is made for trade. No State ships or sells more around the world than the Lone Star State, and especially in my home region in the Houston area of the Eighth Congressional District of Texas.

So many of our jobs depend on free and fair trade, almost 1 million in our State alone. The new USMCA is incredibly vital and incredibly important for us because our two largest trading partners are our friend and neighbor, Mexico, and Canada as well.

I want to thank President Trump for bringing this trade agreement to reality. Like other Presidential candidates, he pledged to renegotiate NAFTA. Unlike any others, he delivered. He was convinced that we could rebuild bipartisan trade here in America by insisting on a fair and level playing field for American workers, and he was exactly right.

Earlier, when he championed tax reform, he did that because every expert and every other Presidential candidate, including Democrats, said: manufacturing in America is dead, just give up, it won't come back.

He believed otherwise, and so did Republicans; and because of our GOP tax cuts and his balanced regulations, we have created over a half a million new manufacturing jobs right here in America over the last 2 years.

I want to thank Ambassador Robert Lighthizer for being the architect of this trade agreement. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, I was a skeptic when he said that we can rebuild bipartisan trade and we can fulfill many of the Democrats' labor and environmental wishes that no other President had ever delivered. So he proved me wrong.

Working closely with Chairman NEAL and others, he, in the original trade agreement of the USMCA a year ago, produced the most pro-labor and pro-environmental trade agreement in American history. In the last few months he has worked closely with Democrats to fine-tune that agreement so that these issues are enforceable. Republicans support that enforcement.

I also appreciate the leadership of Chairman NEAL, without whom we would not be here today. And I want to especially thank my trade staff led by the remarkable Angela Ellard, Josh Snead, David Giordano, and someone whose last day is with us here, Blake Harden as well.

During my time on the Ways and Means Committee, I have been proud to help lead the passage of 12 of the trade agreements America has in place today and two updates of the Trade Promotion Authority that lays out the trade rules for the White House and Congress to follow. So for me this is number 13.

I believe in the freedom to trade, and I truly believe it is the greatest economic freedom we possess. It lays at the heart of our free enterprise system. As Thomas Jefferson wrote: "Commerce with other nations is not only necessary and beneficial to all parties, it is a right and a duty."

It is the freedom to buy, sell, and compete anywhere in the world with as little government interference as possible. It is a freedom that if we build a better mousetrap, then we can sell it anywhere in the world; and when someone else builds a better mousetrap, then we have the freedom to buy it for our family and for our business. That economic freedom has lifted millions out of poverty and provided opportunity, prosperity, and peace, not just for ourselves but for the world.

That is why it was so disappointing the Democrats held up moving forward on this agreement for so long because every day of delay helped China, helped Europe, and helped other countries. This was long overdue.

But the truth of the matter is, we are here today and we have pulled together in a historic vote. America is made for trade, and with our new, strong economy—the most competitive economy today in the world—we need more customers all around the world. That is what this trade agreement does. It delivers on new customers and delivers on new prosperity.

I will close with this, Mr. Speaker. On the Ways and Means Committee I hold a seat formerly held by President George H. W. Bush and former Chairman Bill Archer. When President Bush signed this agreement in San Antonio, he said this so many years ago:

This agreement is an achievement of three strong and proud nations and expresses our confidence in economic freedom and personal freedom in our people's energy and enterprise.

It is an honor to vote today in support of the States U.S.-Mexico-Canada agreement that embraces and enhances economic and personal freedom. Members of Congress should take pride in this work that they have put in to make today's debate on today's trade agreement a reality.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

So on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, we conclude after 14 months of negotiating a hemispheric trade agreement—no small matter and no small accomplishment. It included a visit with the delegation to Mexico to meet with the President of Mexico, President Lopez Obrador. It included a delegation that visited Prime Minister Trudeau in Canada and intense negotiations in both countries, and I think it is fair to say that the conversations in both countries were indeed very spirited.

But before I go to more of the specifics, we would not have gotten here without some very important and critical moments of focused and diligent work by Members of the House and the staff that got us to where we are today.

First, an acknowledgment to Speaker PELOSI, who from day one said that the game plan is to get to yes. Her leadership to get the deal across the line, I think, was matched almost by her top trade adviser, Katherine Monge.

Let me thank the working group members, Trade Subcommittee Chairman BLUMENAUER and his staff Laura Thrift and David Skillman; Representative THOMPSON and his staff, Jennifer Goedke; Representative LARSON and his staff, Scott Stephanou; Representative TERRI SEWELL and her staff, Rob Nuttall; Representative JIM GOMEZ and his staff, Sam Negatu; Representative ROSA DELAURO and her staff, Jack Spasiano; Representative SCHAKOWSKY and her staff, Syd Terry and Osaremen Okolo; and Representative SUZANNE BONAMICI and her staff, Allison Smith.

I want to thank the House Legislative Counsel, Mark Synnes and Kalyani Parthasarathy for their expertise, creativity, and many hours of hard and good work with our staff to prepare this legislation that is more than 200 pages long. They represent the very best of this institution's professionalism.

For the support of colleagues and staff that I received from the diplomatic corps in Mexico City and Ottawa, we should express our gratitude as well to Ms. Elizabeth Hoffman at

our Embassy in Mexico City for her extraordinary talents and efforts to support our attempts as we got to yes.

I have great confidence and belief in the staff members at the Ways and Means Committee, and, yes, on both sides. So I want to thank my committee staff who have worked tirelessly on this agreement: Chief Trade Counsel and staff director of the Trade Subcommittee, Katherine Tai, who led us through the process along with her staff, Keigan Mull, Julia Friedman, Katie White, Alexandra Whittaker, John Catalfamo, and Kate Connor Linton. They were supported by a cast of very bright fellows and interns, Brishailah Brown, Chenoa Lee, and Tiffany Venmahavong.

I also want to thank our colleagues across the aisle. Especially I want to acknowledge today the role that Ambassador Robert Lighthizer played in this. There is something to be said for the experience of Capitol Hill and having been a former staff member. Time and again we thought we weren't going to get to where we wanted to be. And there were some moments, I would say, of incendiary commentary back and forth. Though there were many threats to leave the negotiation, it never materialized because a long walk through this Capitol can solve a lot of challenges.

Mr. BRADY was invaluable as well, and his committee staff, Angela Ellard, Josh Snead, Blake Harden, and David Giordano all played a very important role here.

This really is a bipartisan agreement, and I hope and expect that the challenges to USMCA will allow H.R. 5430 to enjoy broad, bipartisan support.

I certainly am urging support for this because of the following: it bolsters workers' rights; it corrects earlier Trump administration backsliding on environmental obligations to get us to this trade agreement; it eliminated many big giveaways to companies that would have locked in high medicine prices, and it preserves Congress' freedom to legislate to bring those prices down; and it incorporates the strongest enforcement mechanisms, including specifically enhanced mechanisms for enforcing labor rights in any U.S. trade agreement.

There are three titles that are devoted to the United States Government and our role: monitoring and enforcement of USMCA partners' obligations, monitoring and enforcement of USMCA partners' environmental obligations, and more than \$843 million over 4 years that will be dedicated to monitoring and enforcement of labor and environmental obligations, including funds for education and training of workers and inspectors.

We would not have gotten here today, however, without the important considerations of organized labor and the honorable men and women of the AFL/CIO and the Teamsters. We had broad support by including them in the negotiation and the discussions. This

agreement is much the better for it, but it also is the signature accomplishment for all of us who had a chance to participate in it.

Every once in a while, Mr. Speaker, you get to participate in these it-will-never-happen moments, and I believe that this indeed is one of them. So we also thank the NETWORK Lobby for Catholic Social Justice, American Chemistry Council, Association for Accessible Medicines, Coalition of Services Industries, Farmers for Free Trade, Information Technology Industry, the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Council of Textiles Organizations, The Software Alliance, and, indeed, many others.

I hope that this will serve as a template going forward for the two sides to reach a combination on many of the priorities that expire this year that we will include next year. But, also, I think it is an example of when men and women in this institution of goodwill—not just in the season—but men and women of goodwill can find common occurrence and common ground on an issue, in the end, that is really important to all members of the American family.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, twenty-five years ago, I strongly opposed and helped lead the opposition against the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). While our efforts narrowly failed in the House, I was proud to vote against it.

Then-President Clinton said that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) would create thousands of good-paying U.S. jobs and would result in trade surpluses between \$9–\$12 billion. The reality, however, couldn't be further from the truth, and NAFTA has been an absolute disaster.

After railing against NAFTA and promising to deliver a dramatically improved deal or withdraw from the agreement altogether, President Trump and his administration delivered the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA). By all accounts, the USMCA was nothing more than a continuation of NAFTA's same failed policies.

After months of extensive negotiations between House Democrats and the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), important improvements have been made to the USMCA on a number of issues, including improvements I have long fought for and helped secure.

After extensive work with USTR, I am proud to have secured provisions in the USMCA that will better enable the U.S. to safeguard our roads. The deal includes language that allows the United States to restrict domestic long-haul services by Mexican trucks in the event of material harm to U.S. trucking suppliers, operators, and drivers. I am pleased that this restriction provides teeth to protect the U.S. trucking industry from unfair trade practices by Mexican motor carriers, and provides for consideration of impacts on driver wages and working conditions, to avoid a race to the bottom in trucking.

I am also pleased that damaging provisions that would have kept prescription drug costs high have been removed. House Democrats were able to successfully negotiate the re-

moval of provisions that would have kept cheaper, generic drugs off the market longer.

Working Americans have been waiting for more than two decades for the opportunity to fix NAFTA's failed policies. Throughout my career I have fought for a truly transformative replacement that supports American workers while safeguarding the environment and protecting consumers. While it is an improvement from NAFTA, I do not believe that the USMCA is that transformative deal, and, as a result, I will be voting against it today.

The fact of the matter is that there is a deeply entrenched system of wage and rights suppression in Mexico. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. jobs were lost to Mexico as a result of this system, and these jobs aren't coming back to our country. Without upending this entrenched system altogether, we will not be able to raise wages and standards for Mexican workers, which means we will continue to struggle to prevent the hemorrhaging of American jobs that are being outsourced to low wage jobs in Mexico. I do not believe Mexico has devoted the funding or the staffing necessary for these changes, nor do I believe this agreement goes far enough in ensuring that workers and the U.S. have the remedies needed to prevent abuses from continuing to occur moving forward. Democratic and Republican administrations have shirked their responsibilities to fight for higher labor standards and fair trade policies, and I do not believe this agreement does enough to prevent those kind of abuses moving forward.

Further, the Republican tax bill enacted in 2017 actually promotes outsourcing by allowing multinational corporations to cut their tax rate in half if they shut a factory in the U.S. and move it to Mexico. I will reintroduce legislation next year to eliminate this incentive.

Beyond this, the USMCA is at its core a deal that will continue to promote pro-polluter, climate-denying policies. There are no substantive provisions to seriously curb air and water pollution, the deal completely ignores climate change, and its environmental enforcement mechanism is not nearly strong enough. We need to do much more to take bold steps to address climate change and to curb corporate polluting.

I am also disappointed that the administration abandoned its original position to eliminate chapter 19. I have long called for the elimination of this unconstitutional chapter which allows foreign tribunals to overrule U.S. trade protections against heavily subsidized foreign imports, and I am disappointed that the administration acquiesced to Canada.

While I don't believe this agreement sets forward a bold vision for a 21st century trade agreement, the reality is that this agreement will become law, and that means the real work of monitoring and enforcing the new provisions will begin. I will push for robust oversight and enforcement of the labor and environmental standards and work to ensure that any and all flaws are appropriately addressed when the USMCA's sunset provisions kick-in six years from now.

I have spent my entire career fighting on behalf of the American worker, including voting against every so-called free trade deal proposed to Congress that undermines our workforce and enables the destruction of our environment. I will continue to fight for truly transformative deals that create a new standard for how trade agreements should support the U.S. and its people.

Mr. Speaker, despite President Trump's promises to fix NAFTA and make a perfect trade agreement that will bring jobs back to the United States, the NAFTA 2.0 agreement signed last year prioritized corporations over American workers. Democratic lawmakers negotiated vigorously to improve the shoddy 2018 agreement, and they should be applauded for their work on the U.S. Mexico Canada Agreement (USMCA). The USMCA marks a significant improvement over the NAFTA 2.0 agreement on issues related to labor standards. The USMCA establishes labor specific enforcement mechanisms, removes NAFTA's Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) regime, and eliminates huge giveaways to the pharmaceutical industry. While significant strides were made, the agreement ultimately falls short of the critical labor and environmental needs that face our country today. Although I regretfully had to miss today's vote due to a family emergency, I would have voted no on the USMCA.

The USMCA does take long-overdue steps to improve conditions for Mexican workers and remove incentives for companies to move American jobs to Mexico. To be clear, this agreement will do nothing to bring back hundreds of thousands of manufacturing jobs to the U.S., and the Republican's tax bill signed into law last year still contains major incentives for corporations to outsource and off-shore jobs. Mexico's promise to provide new labor protections, and the new rules included in this agreement, will help many workers in Mexico. However, the USMCA's enforcement mechanisms simply will not do enough to ensure these new rules are followed and could make it impossible for the U.S. to hold Mexico responsible if these promised reforms do not take effect.

Unfortunately, USMCA fails to address our climate crisis and adequately protect our environment. The agreement does not include enforcement of the Paris Climate Agreement or even the phrase "climate change." It leaves intact NAFTA's incentives for corporations to dodge clean energy policies in the U.S. and leaves enforcement to a NAFTA-style inter-agency committee with little authority beyond writing reports. The agreement would not address documented pollution dumping and sets no limits on air, water, or land pollution. The deregulatory standards would also make it even harder for the U.S. to set new environmental regulations in the future. It was impossible for me to support this agreement without significantly more robust and binding environmental standards.

I respect and appreciate the hard work and dedication of my Democratic colleagues in transforming President Trump's terrible NAFTA 2.0 agreement into a more robust and fair USMCA. However, because of the weak environmental standards and the lack of robust enforcement of labor rights, I cannot support it.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the US-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementing Act. Updating NAFTA is crucial to America's workforce and our economy. Our vote today is not just about a trade bill. For our nation, trade has never been singularly about the exchange of goods and services across borders. This bill is about making monumental progress in the fundamental framework of trade negotiations. It is about America's competitive edge, the rights of our work-

ers, the stewardship of our environment, and so much more.

Millions of American jobs depend on trade with Canada and Mexico. NAFTA is a 25-year-old agreement that has long needed an upgrade to meet the demands of our times. American workers and American businesses deserve the best possible update that we can negotiate, I believe that is precisely what we have here.

As a member of the New Democrat Coalition, and a strong supporter of international trade, I have for years fought for the advancement of key New Dem priorities to be included in trade bills. With USMCA I am pleased that under Speaker PELOSI's leadership Democrats negotiated for many of these priorities and they are in this agreement.

I am proud that we fought for and secured stronger labor and environmental provisions and the elimination of language in the implementing bill that would have allowed the administration to unilaterally lower the U.S. de minimis threshold.

The great state of New York shares a border with Canada. New York's connection with its top trading partner, Canada, is strengthened in this agreement. With USMCA, New York's sixteen billion dollars in exports to Canada can increase, jobs are secured, and we lay the groundwork for deeper economic ties while making progress in the best interest of citizens throughout North America.

America's strength has always been undergirded by our prowess in trade. New York has a special place in American history in that regard. With USMCA we safeguard our nation's ability to compete, while being caretakers of our environment and upholding the rights of our workers. After 14 months of negotiations, I am proud to support this bipartisan agreement, and push forward the framework for trade agreements in the years to come. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 5430—The United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA).

Throughout my entire career, I have heard the promises of free trade agreements, yet have seen the subsequent challenges faced by steelworkers and the American manufacturing industry.

Specifically, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was rationalized on the promise of creating good-paying American jobs. Instead, this agreement contributed to the loss of over 700,000 American jobs through outsourcing and suppressed American wages. NAFTA has also led to the degradation of our environment through the lack of strong environmental protections and the consequent increase of greenhouse gas emissions in North America.

While I recognize that the USMCA appears to be an improvement over NAFTA, I remain deeply skeptical that it does enough.

For example, the USMCA includes a provision for enforcing labor standards. However, there is a lack of clarity on timelines for certain steps throughout the investigation process, which could delay enforcing penalties on violators of the agreement. I also remain leery that our trading partners have not demonstrated the commitment, fortitude, or track record to faithfully execute the labor protections detailed in this agreement.

Additionally, the USMCA includes a provision to require 40 to 45 percent of the vehicles made in the United States, Mexico, and Canada to be made by workers who earn—on average—at least \$16 per hour. However, the calculation requirements for the average wage allows for the inclusion of wages related to research, development, and information technology employees, which could cause the continued suppression of wages for American manufacturing employees.

Further, in regard to environmental protections, the USMCA includes a provision that recognizes pollution as a threat to public health. However, it does not create binding standards and omits essential limits on air, water, and land pollution, which could create more challenges for future generations.

Finally, I would emphasize that advancing the USMCA to the full House for a vote within a week of receiving the text circumvents Congress' responsibility to the American people to thoroughly examine this agreement, which will have profound implications for our workers, our economy, and our environment. I am especially disappointed that this process has not afforded all Members of Congress a real opportunity to debate, amend, or improve this text before final passage.

If we have learned anything from the negative impacts of NAFTA and other free trade agreements, let it be that all Americans and all American workers deserve thoughtful, secure, and truly enforceable trade agreements.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5430, the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act. This legislation ratifies the USMCA, an update to the North American Free Trade Agreement agreed to by the governments of the United States, Canada and Mexico last year.

Over the past year, House Democrats have made the USMCA a better deal for the American people. New provisions in this trade agreement improve the original language by strengthening provisions related to labor and the environment. Most importantly, House Democrats fought hard to ensure Congress kept its authority to address the rising costs of prescription drugs by stripping out a giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry that would have locked in high prices for biologics across North America.

As the dean of the Texas Congressional Delegation, I know how important trade is to my state. This is an issue that unites Democrats and Republicans across Texas. Whenever trade is brought up, everyone pays attention because it's one of the drivers of our economy. In North Texas, Canada is one of our largest trading partners, and many goods that are transferred between the three countries in this agreement make their way through North Texas either on our highways, through the DFW International Airport, or through the Union Pacific Dallas International Terminal Inland Port in my district. While the energy sector created jobs and built the economy in North Texas, NAFTA and other trade agreements have only made our economy stronger.

Last year, I invited Ambassador Lighthizer to speak to the Texas Congressional Delegation about the USMCA and the profound impact it would have on our state. Ambassador Lighthizer and his staff at the office of the United States Trade Representative held similar meetings with other congressional delegations and working groups so that they could

understand all points of view on this agreement. Their willingness to work tirelessly alongside House Democrats to make this agreement a better deal for the American people deserves recognition.

Mr. Speaker, trade policy shouldn't be an issue that divides the members of this chamber on partisan or regional lines. We see here today what can be done when both sides come together to advance the causes of American workers, farmers and consumers. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, it has been over a year since President Trump successfully negotiated the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

This is a good deal that will benefit every corner of the country. USMCA will empower businesses of all sizes to grow and create jobs, and it is a substantial improvement over NAFTA.

Mr. Speaker, as it turns out this week is the 116th Anniversary of the Wright Brothers making the first flight in a powered aircraft. As we all know, the Wright Brothers were innovators and they traveled to North Carolina for this historic achievement.

To this day, North Carolina continues to attract the world's most creative and innovative workforce. One prime example is the enormous amount of pharmaceutical research that takes place. Lifesaving drugs are being made in my back yard and the world is better off for it.

This Administration was successful in getting Mexico and Canada to raise their exclusivity protections for cutting-edge biologic drugs. This was a monumental achievement. It is incredibly disappointing that Democrats sought to weaken these standards and actively worked against American innovators. These standards would have protected the hard work that is done by our health care industry as they work to come up with new cures and save more lives.

By stripping these protections from the final agreement—Congressional Democrats have effectively kneecapped the dedicated scientists, doctors and manufacturers working around the clock to develop new cures.

I have a tough time understanding why American lawmakers would actively advocate against the interest of American companies trying to do business abroad.

Ensuring that American innovators' rights are protected in Mexico and Canada would have had no impact on drug pricing. The Ways and Means Committee has been over that topic before, and to insinuate that there is a correlation between protecting our inventions in Mexico and higher drug prices in the U.S. is disingenuous.

While I support the USMCA, the absence of these protections is a missed opportunity and we should do better.

Miss GONZALEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico. Mr. Speaker, trade with Canada and Mexico is a crucial component of our economy. Last year, the U.S. exported just over \$565 billion in goods to these two nations. It is estimated that approximately 12 million American jobs rely on North American trade.

Our Nation's trade partnership with Canada and Mexico is particularly important for our state and local economies. In Puerto Rico, for example, exports to these two countries totaled \$1.38 billion in 2018. This represents an

increase of 161 percent from pre-NAFTA levels in 1993, when exports from the Island to Canada and Mexico totaled just \$528.8 million.

Our economy clearly requires that we preserve and strengthen U.S. trade ties with Canada and Mexico. To achieve this, we must pass the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, or USMCA.

USMCA would not only ensure that U.S. manufacturers, farmers, and service providers can continue to access the Canadian and Mexican markets, but it would also rebalance and modernize NAFTA—our outdated trade agreement—into a 21st century, high-standard trade deal.

For instance, USMCA creates a new digital trade chapter and includes provisions to strengthen intellectual property (IP) protections critical to driving innovation. This is particularly important for jurisdictions like Puerto Rico, which is the top U.S. exporter of pharmaceutical and medicine products.

USMCA similarly seeks to level the playing field for workers by including enforceable labor standards. It is also the first trade agreement with a chapter focusing specifically on small and medium-sized businesses to help them grow and reach new markets.

The U.S. International Trade Commission estimates that USMCA would boost GDP by \$68.2 billion and would add roughly 176,000 jobs.

USMCA is a clear win for our Nation.

Mr. RESCHENTHALER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA) negotiated by President Trump which will generate new economic opportunities for Pennsylvania workers and families.

Thanks to President Trump's economic policies, earlier this year, Pennsylvania's unemployment hit an all-time low of 3.8 percent. In his first two years in office, the president fostered job and wage growth by enacting the largest tax reform in 31 years and cutting burdensome regulations that handcuffed Pennsylvania employers. But it's the USMCA, his rewrite of the North American Free Trade Agreement, that promises to be an even greater boon for my state's economy and the nation.

Pennsylvania is uniquely positioned to benefit from the USMCA given our strong ties with Canada and Mexico. In 2017 alone, Pennsylvania exported over \$10 billion worth of goods to Canada and over \$4 billion worth of goods to Mexico. Nearly 500,000 jobs across the state are supported by U.S. trade with our North American neighbors. By removing the red tape required to trade, we can empower job creators to grow their businesses and hire even more workers.

Importantly, the USMCA improves access to international markets for many of the industries that drive our state's economy. Pennsylvania farmers currently export over \$1 billion in goods each year to Canada and Mexico. This agreement creates even more export opportunities by eliminating Canada's protectionist dairy program and opening access for chicken and egg exports.

U.S. manufacturing is another key sector that will enjoy new protections under the USMCA. The deal includes stronger rules of origin, meaning more goods and materials, including Pennsylvania steel, will be manufactured in the U.S. Further, the agreement puts in place new enforceable labor standards to

level the playing field for American workers and includes new commitments to address non-tariff barriers that currently hinder trade.

The USMCA also includes, for the first time ever, a chapter dedicated to digital trade. I applaud the administration's work to promote digital trade and protect the intellectual property of American innovators. In my district alone, nearly 1,000 people are employed by the movie and television industry and rely on this work to pay their bills and feed their families. It is critical that we build upon the strengths and accomplishments of the USMCA and ensure future trade deals leave adequate space for Congress to work together with the president and American creators to reform and update current copyright laws, including Section 512 of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, which was written in 1998 and has not kept up with the times. Future trade deals should exclude this provision so that Congress can work in a bipartisan manner to ensure U.S. law better protects the creative professionals living in my district and across the nation.

Mr. Speaker, President Trump has already fostered an economic resurgence through his pro-growth policies, and the USMCA will further that progress. I am proud to support USMCA today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of December 16, 2019, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 777. An Act to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

H.R. 3196. An Act to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the "Vera C. Rubin Observatory".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 153. An Act to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes.

S. 2774. An Act to direct the Attorney General to establish and carry out a Veteran Treatment Court Program.

S. 3105. An Act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

456 North Meridian Street in Indianapolis, Indiana, as the "Richard G. Lugar Post Office".

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. CON. RES. 31. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance and significance of the 2020 Census and encouraging individuals, families, and households across the United States to participate in the 2020 Census to ensure a complete and accurate count.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-292, as amended by Public Law 106-55, Public Law 107-228, and Public Law 112-75, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom:

Rabbi Sharon A. Kleinbaum of New York vice Ahmed M. Khawaja of California.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1345

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of New York) at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1407

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts) at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 772, I call up the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 772, the

amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means, printed in the bill, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 5377

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION FOR 2019 OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) SPECIAL RULE FOR LIMITATION ON INDIVIDUAL DEDUCTIONS FOR 2019.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2018, and before January 1, 2020, paragraph (6) shall be applied by substituting '\$20,000 in the case of a joint return' for '\$5,000 in the case of a married individual filing a separate return'."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2018.

SEC. 3. ELIMINATION FOR 2020 AND 2021 OF LIMITATION ON DEDUCTION OF STATE AND LOCAL TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b)(6)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting "in the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 2020, or after December 31, 2021," before "the aggregate amount of taxes".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 164(b)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "For purposes of subparagraph (B)" and inserting "For purposes of this section";

(2) by striking "January 1, 2018" and inserting "January 1, 2022";

(3) by striking "December 31, 2017, shall" and inserting "December 31, 2021, shall"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following: "For purposes of this section, in the case of State or local taxes with respect to any real or personal property paid during a taxable year beginning in 2020 or 2021, the Secretary shall prescribe rules which treat all or a portion of such taxes as paid in a taxable year or years other than the taxable year in which actually paid as necessary or appropriate to prevent the avoidance of the limitations of this subsection."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxes paid or accrued in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 4. INCREASE IN DEDUCTION FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS.

(a) INCREASE.—Section 62(a)(2)(D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking "\$250" and inserting "\$500".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 62(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking "2015" and inserting "2019";

(2) by striking "\$250" and inserting "\$500"; and

(3) in subparagraph (B), by striking "2014" and inserting "2018".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2018.

SEC. 5. ABOVE-THE-LINE DEDUCTION ALLOWED FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES OF FIRST RESPONDERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 62(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(F) CERTAIN EXPENSES OF FIRST RESPONDERS.—The deductions allowed by section 162

which consist of expenses, not in excess of \$500, paid or incurred by a first responder—

"(i) as tuition or fees for the participation of the first responder in professional development courses related to service as a first responder, or

"(ii) for uniforms used by the first responder in service as a first responder."

(b) FIRST RESPONDER DEFINED.—Section 62(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) FIRST RESPONDER.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2)(F), the term 'first responder' means, with respect to any taxable year, any individual who is employed as a law enforcement officer, firefighter, paramedic, or emergency medical technician for at least 1000 hours during such taxable year."

(c) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Section 62(d)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 4, is further amended by striking "the \$500 amount in subsection (a)(2)(D)" and inserting "the \$500 amount in each of subparagraphs (D) and (F) of subsection (a)(2)".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 6. INCREASE OF TOP MARGINAL INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATE UNDER TEMPORARY RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The tables contained in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E) of section 1(j)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are each amended by striking "37%" and inserting "39.6%" and—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking "\$600,000" each place such term appears and inserting "\$479,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$161,379" and inserting "\$119,029";

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking "\$500,000" each place such term appears and inserting "\$452,400"; and

(B) by striking "\$149,298" and inserting "\$132,638";

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking "\$500,000" each place such term appears and inserting "\$425,800"; and

(B) by striking "\$150,689.50" and inserting "\$124,719.50"; and

(4) in subparagraph (D)—

(A) by striking "\$300,000" each place such term appears and inserting "\$239,500"; and

(B) by striking "\$80,689.50" and inserting "\$59,514.50".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1(j)(4)(B)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking "37 percent" and inserting "39.6 percent";

(B) in subclause (II), by striking "37-percent bracket" and inserting "39.6-percent bracket"; and

(C) in the heading, by striking "37-PERCENT BRACKET" and inserting "39.6-PERCENT BRACKET".

(2) Section 1(j)(4)(C) of such Code is amended—

(A) in clause (i)(II), by striking "paragraph (5)(B)(i)(IV)" and inserting "paragraph (5)(B)(iv)"; and

(B) by amending clause (ii) to read as follows: "(ii) the amount which would (without regard to this paragraph) be taxed at a rate below 39.6 percent shall not be more than the sum of—

"(I) the earned taxable income of such child, plus

"(II) the maximum dollar amount for the 35-percent rate bracket for estates and trusts."

(3) The heading of section 1(j)(5) of such Code is amended to read as follows: "APPLICATION OF ZERO PERCENT CAPITAL GAIN RATE BRACKETS".

(4) Subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1(j)(5) of such Code are amended to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (h)(1)(B)(i) shall be applied by substituting 'below the maximum zero rate amount' for 'which would (without regard to this paragraph) be taxed at a rate below 25 percent'.

“(B) MAXIMUM ZERO RATE AMOUNT DEFINED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘maximum zero rate amount’ means—

“(i) in the case of a joint return or surviving spouse, \$77,200,

“(ii) in the case of an individual who is a head of household (as defined in section 2(b)), \$51,700,

“(iii) in the case of any other individual (other than an estate or trust), an amount equal to ½ of the amount in effect for the taxable year under clause (i), and

“(iv) in the case of an estate or trust, \$2,600.”.

(5) Section 1(j)(5)(C) of such Code is amended by striking “clauses (i) and (ii) of”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

(d) SECTION 15 NOT TO APPLY.—Section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall not apply to any change in a rate of tax by reason of any amendment made by this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to insert in the RECORD extraneous material on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. This bill would temporarily repeal the SALT cap in order to restore fairness in our tax code and provide Congress time to develop more comprehensive tax reform.

The current cap on the State and local tax deduction reflects the sloppy and cynical nature of the 2017 Republican tax bill. This bill was hastily rammed through Congress in just 51 days without a hearing, without an opportunity to hear from State and local governments, and without an opportunity to hear from teachers or first responders.

Republicans decided from the beginning, from behind closed doors, to include a cap on SALT deductions in order to help finance their tax cuts for corporations and the rich.

In my home State, California, average SALT deductions are \$20,448. A total of 6.5 million California families, or 35.6 percent of tax filers, claimed the deduction in 2017.

The double taxation of earnings people have already paid in State and local taxes inhibit State and local governments' ability to fund even the most vital of programs, including emergency services and public education.

H.R. 5377 fixes this problem by restoring the longstanding tax precedent that protects State and local governments' ability to raise revenue to fund these services. And this fix doesn't add a single dime to the deficit.

Furthermore, this bill provides tax relief to the middle-class public servants left behind by the Republican tax bill by doubling the out-of-pocket deduction for teachers, classroom expenses, and creating a new deduction for expenses for first responders. In 2017, 354,990 teachers in California claimed the educator expense deduction, and they will all get double under this bill.

The short-sightedness of the SALT cap had further consequences for middle-class taxpayers in high-tax States: Capping the SALT deduction diminished the incentive for middle-class taxpayers to claim tax benefits that encourage homeownership and charitable deductions. By limiting the SALT deduction and raising the standard deduction, fewer middle-class taxpayers benefit from taking the mortgage interest deduction and charitable giving deductions.

Homeownership is an important way for middle-class families to build wealth. Eliminating incentives for charitable giving undermines local charities that rely on donations from middle-class members of their communities.

I think my colleagues from both sides of the aisle can agree that these are the types of behavior we should be encouraging through our tax code. This bill reverses the Republicans' actions to undercut these middle-class benefits to finance tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans.

Finally, this bill isn't about cutting taxes for high earners. This bill is about tax fairness, ensuring that taxpayers are not double-taxed by being required to pay Federal income tax on earnings they pay in State and local taxes and appeals to the core tenets of our federalist system.

In the spirit of tax fairness, this bill is responsibly offset by restoring the top marginal rate back to 39.6 percent for the highest income bracket.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a tax cut for the wealthy and a green light for State and local politicians to raise taxes on local families even higher.

The Center for American Progress and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities are liberal organizations I don't generally agree with, but today, I have to say I do.

The Center for American Progress has made it plain. They said repealing the SALT cap shouldn't be a high priority, in fact, that this is overwhelmingly a tax cut for the rich.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities agrees. They said repealing the

SALT cap, what Democrats are proposing to do today, is regressive and overwhelmingly benefits high-income households. And they go further and say this is little help to the middle class.

□ 1415

It is a sad day when it is obvious to everyone but Democrats that they are championing a huge tax cut for millionaires and billionaires, while the middle class in America get zip.

Today we debate their insistence on hiking taxes on Main Street businesses across America to pay for their massive tax windfall for the wealthy 1 percent.

You think your local property taxes are high now? This legislation is a starter pistol for a new race among State and local leaders.

Who of them will be first to raise property taxes, sales taxes, and income taxes even higher on working families and local businesses?

These unpopular local taxes, frankly, are brutal enough.

This bill truly is a tax cut for the few.

According to the liberal Tax Policy Center, only 1 percent of taxpayers in America paid more taxes last year due to the reasonable SALT cap, 1 percent; in California, only 2; in New York, a mere 3.

The rest of taxpayers in America either received a tax cut or they broke even. That is because the Republican Tax Cuts and Jobs Act lowered taxes on income across the board. We doubled the child tax deduction and expanded it to far more families. We doubled the standard deduction so more working families keep more of what they earn. We eliminated the alternative minimum tax for households making less than \$1 million.

This was important, because more and more families, including in high-tax States, especially in high-tax States, found the AMT canceled out their charitable and SALT deductions completely.

Another myth that has been debunked is that tax reform hurts State budgets. It is just the opposite.

Many States across America enjoyed a windfall in new revenues, an average of 6 percent, with stronger economies, more workers, and an expanded tax base.

California Governor Gavin Newsom wrongly predicted capping SALT would result in lower revenues for California. In truth, his State brought in a whopping \$3 billion more in personal income taxes than he predicted. It was the same story in all the high-tax States, including New Jersey.

So the question is, what did these States do with their windfall? Did they pocket these extra dollars or did they pass them through to their families and local businesses by reducing State and local taxes?

To their credit, 13 States reduced their SALT tax burden, but not in the high-tax States, who need it most.

States like New Jersey actually raised their State and local taxes, while New York, Illinois, and Massachusetts are debating even higher SALT taxes.

So if governors, legislators, and mayors keep raising local taxes with a SALT cap, imagine how high they will raise them without it?

There is a price to be paid from high State and local taxes. In truth, these are terrific States with dynamic economies and really good people. But according to MoneyWise.com, the four States Americans are fleeing from the most are New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and Illinois.

Millennials, young people, are doing the same, but you can add California to that list. These young people love their States, with good reason, but they just can't see a future there with high taxes and impossibly high costs.

In the end, though, why should low-tax States be forced, through the tax code, to subsidize high-tax States?

Why should a farmer in Nebraska subsidize a banker in Manhattan?

Why should a single mom in New Jersey or a janitor in a building who doesn't itemize their taxes subsidize the billionaire in the penthouse who does?

LeBron James, an iconic athlete, legendary really, of the Lakers, he will receive an estimated \$2.4 million tax break next year because of the Democrats' bill, but the janitor and the beer vendor in Staples Center, they get nothing.

Gerrit Cole, a former Astros, is going to the Yankees as their new ace. He will get an estimated \$850,000 next year, but that parking lot attendant at Yankee Stadium gets nothing.

That is what this bill does, because more than half of the SALT deduction goes to millionaire and billionaire households.

Madam Speaker, the SALT cap of \$10,000 is higher than the national average of SALT deductions, and because of Republican lawmakers in high-tax States, who weighed in aggressively during tax reform, it can be used for property, sales, or income taxes. And the AMT, which is worth up to \$10,000 in tax breaks, was eliminated.

Thanks to pro-growth tax reform, our U.S. economy has roared into gear as the most competitive economy on the planet, with the lowest unemployment in half a century, paychecks increasing the fastest in more than a decade, wage growth outpacing inflation by \$1,000 a year for average working families, American manufacturing is back, and we have a million more job openings than workers.

America is once again a land of opportunity.

Placing a cap on the SALT deduction to let middle-class families—not the wealthy—keep more of what they earned is a crucial component of achieving this economic victory for American workers and their families.

That old, broken, regressive SALT tax break for the wealthy has no place

in a fair, modern tax code, and the positive growth in America since its removal is a clear demonstration of that fact.

One final thing: We often hear that limiting the SALT deduction is double-taxation and unconstitutional. The courts and tax policy experts have debunked these myths.

We hear a lot about moocher States, but the only moochers in this debate are the State and local politicians who think it is their money, and they are mooching off the backs of hardworking families and small businesses in high-tax States.

I know my Democrat colleagues are sincere in this effort. But with this bill, you have officially claimed the mantle "party of the rich."

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge all my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

And, again, I offer this: Republicans are committed to working with Democrats to make our tax code even more competitive, to make our economy even stronger, and to never stop working to help the little guy in the middle class, and giving tax breaks to billionaires, encouraging States to raise their taxes even more is not the way to do it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I just want to point out that the irony of my friend's testimony today, my friend from Texas' testimony, shouldn't be lost on any of us.

Remember, it was the Republicans that created this problem with their tax bill. They did a tax bill that benefited corporations and the wealthiest people in the country, and then to say that somehow they are protecting regular folks is really laughable.

That tax cut cost us, in the debt, \$2.3 trillion.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), for yielding.

I rise today to defend the taxpayers of our country, people who believe in a strong America with great schools and great infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, I launched "12 Days of SALT" last week to urge this House to lift the 2017 tax bill's \$10,000 cap on the State and local tax deduction.

Today is the 11th day of SALT. I have been on the floor for 11 days to talk about this. This is an issue of tax fairness, with people investing in their communities, in schools, and in infrastructure only to face double-taxation as the Federal Government punishes these efforts.

The 2017 tax bill was an attack on New Jersey taxpayers. New Jersey already sends more money to Washington and gets back less than nearly every State in the country.

Our bill will put money back in the pockets of our residents and communities, and not just in New Jersey. This

bill provides relief for 13.1 million Americans.

It also doubles the deduction for teachers' out-of-pocket expenses and creates a new deduction for first responders to offset work-related costs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support tax relief to support our teachers and first responders and pass this bill.

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), the Republican leader of the Tax Policy Subcommittee, and I ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I must admit, I am a bit puzzled today as to why we are here for this bill. Our work in the House is almost done for the year.

We have funded the Federal Government and extended expiring programs like flood insurance. We are about to pass USMCA with a record vote. Our Democratic colleagues can go home and celebrate that they voted to make history in impeaching the President.

But apparently, before we go home for Christmas, we also need to give Ebenezer Scrooge a tax cut, even though we know the Senate won't take up the bill.

Before we get into the problems with today's bill, we should review the positives of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which this bill seeks to undermine.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act lowered tax rates for all Americans and increased the child tax credit.

We doubled the standard deduction from \$6,000 for individuals and \$12,000 for married couples to \$12,000 for individuals and \$24,000 for couples.

And to help ensure Federal tax policy doesn't reward States and cities for raising their taxes sky high, we instituted a \$10,000, very thoughtful, cap on State and local tax deductions to ensure Americans in low-tax States don't pay an unfair share of Federal taxes.

Thanks to the combination of lower rates, larger child tax credit, and higher standard deduction under TCJA, for example, a single mom with two kids doesn't pay a penny in Federal income tax until her income exceeds \$53,000.

In other words, we ensure that that mom doesn't owe Federal income tax until her income exceeds not just \$15 an hour, but \$25 per hour.

For Americans who do pay income tax, the higher standard deduction means 29 million more households had their tax returns simplified because they could take the standard deduction instead of itemizing.

How does the majority propose to improve our tax code today? Not by simplifying the code or ensuring our tax code is more equitable, but by passing a temporary—emphasis on "temporary"—tax cut, which largely benefits people with incomes between—

please, listen—\$200,000 and \$1 million per year—perhaps a new definition of the middle class—paid for by permanently increasing taxes on small businesses.

Let me say that again. If you make between \$0 and \$75,000, this bill does not give you tax relief, or a tax cut.

If you make between \$75,000 and \$200,000, there is a small chance you could get a small tax cut.

If you make between \$200,000 per year and \$1 million per year, you have the best chance of getting a tax cut.

Madam Speaker, we should continue working together to find ways to improve the tax code for all Americans.

This bill makes the code both more complex and less progressive.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), a great public servant and someone who has partnered with us on a number of important issues.

Mr. KING of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of this legislation. I want to commend my colleague, Congressman SUOZZI, for introducing it.

Madam Speaker, I am really disappointed in my Republican colleagues. They are raising a class warfare argument. They sound like the progressive left.

The fact is, one of the reasons why cities like New York and counties like Nassau and Suffolk have had to raise their property taxes is because for 50 years, we have been subsidizing other States.

Seventy percent to 80 percent of the money we send to the Federal Government comes back to us, the rest goes to other States. So during all these years when they have been able to develop using our money, we have had to raise local taxes, and now they are turning it into class warfare.

These aren't millionaires. The people in my district who are getting screwed by this are not millionaires. They are cops, they are firefighters, construction workers, the people who answered the call on 9/11.

What they are doing is undermining the middle class.

What is middle class in other States may be different from mine.

The reason we are high is because of the fact we have had to subsidize all the rest of them for all these years, sort of like when politicians come to New York to raise their money and then go back home and vote against us.

I will say that the strongest advocate for this—when this was first raised in 1986 in leading to the defeat of the attempt to take away SALT—was Donald Trump. He said the States that work the hardest would get hurt the most because of this.

Now, also let me just say—and I will end on this—that we have subsidized

other States long enough. We are asking for fairness. It is wrong for conservatives to be talking about having a tax on a tax.

Madam Speaker, I urge passage of this bill to have some equity in the tax code.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a series of statements in opposition to H.R. 5377 from Americans for Tax Reform, Americans for Prosperity, National Taxpayers Union, Heritage Action, and Parity for Main Street Employers.

KEY VOTE: ATR URGES NO VOTE ON H.R. 5377, A PLEDGE VIOLATION

Posted by Alex Hendrie on Wednesday, December 18th, 2019, 3:00 PM PERMALINK

The House of Representatives is set to vote on H.R. 5377, the "Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act."

ATR urges a "NO" vote.

This legislation is a violation of the Taxpayer Protection Pledge, a commitment made by 218 members in the House and Senate to oppose any and all net tax increases.

If passed into law, it will raise taxes on individuals and small businesses that file through the individual income tax system. This bill trades a temporary rollback of the SALT cap for a permanent rate hike.

This legislation is a net tax increase of \$2.4 billion over the ten-year budget window, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

H.R. 5377 also rolls back the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, passed by Republicans and signed into law by President Trump.

"The Trump tax cuts reduced taxes across the board. This legislation is step one toward abolishing the entire Trump tax cuts and increasing taxes on the middle class, a key goal of every Democrat presidential candidate," said Grover Norquist, President of Americans for Tax Reform.

The legislation raises the cap on the state and local tax deduction from \$10,000 to \$20,000 for 2019 and removes the cap entirely for 2020 and 2021.

The legislation also raises the top rate from 37 to 39.6 percent and lowers the threshold that this top rate kicks in for all filing statuses.

Under current law, the 37 percent bracket kicks in for a single filer at \$518,400 in income. Under the legislation, the new top rate is increased to 39.6 percent and the threshold is lowered to \$441,475 of income.

Similarly, a family taking the married filing jointly status currently hits the 37 percent bracket at \$622,050 in income. Under the legislation, this family will hit the 39.6 percent bracket at \$496,000 in income.

REPEALING OR ROLLING BACK THE SALT CAP IS REGRESSIVE

94 percent of the benefits from repealing the SALT cap would go to taxpayers making more than \$200,000 a year.

The left leaning Center for Budget and Policy Priorities has stated that this proposal would be "regressive and costly."

The Center for American Progress has stated that repeal of the SALT cap "should not be a top priority" as it would "overwhelmingly benefit the wealthy, not the middle class."

Senator Michael Bennet (D-CO) recently criticized efforts to repeal the SALT cap noting that it runs counter to Democrat ideals: "We can say we're for a progressive tax bill and for fighting inequality, or we can support the SALT deduction, but it's really hard to do both of those things."

REPEALING OR ROLLING BACK THE SALT CAP IS ALSO UNNECESSARY

While Democrats claim the SALT cap raised taxes, this is overstated and misleading.

The TCJA reduced taxes for roughly 90 percent of Americans and for taxpayers at every income level through lower rates, the expanded standard deduction, and the doubling of the child tax credit.

Furthermore, repeal of the Alternative Minimum Tax meant that 4.5 million families were able to claim \$10,000 in SALT deductions, as the AMT disallowed this deduction.

The SALT deduction subsidizes high tax, big government states. This deduction is rarely used by middle class families as they take the standard deduction instead of itemizing. Capping this deduction has meant that the federal government is no longer providing a benefit to upper income earners in blue states.

ATR urges a NO vote on this regressive legislation that violates the Taxpayer Protection Pledge.

AFF KEY VOTE ALERT: VOTE NO ON H.R. 5377, THE RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT

DECEMBER 16, 2019

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of Americans for Prosperity activists across America, I urge you to vote NO on H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

This vote may be recorded in our 2019 session legislative scorecard.

H.R. 5377 would temporarily undo some of the many benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Temporarily increasing the cap on the SALT deduction (from \$10,000 to \$20,000) would make the tax code less fair and more complex, but also increase bad incentives for state and local governments to raise taxes. The benefits of lifting the SALT cap would go to states with higher tax levels. Meanwhile, states with lower tax levels, like Florida and Texas, will be once again forced to subsidize the federal tax tab for states like New York, California, and New Jersey.

Moreover, H.R. 5377 would temporarily raise the top tax rate on the highest earners and increase the number of taxpayers paying that rate—one of the very groups that will benefit from lifting the SALT cap. This makes no sense.

For these reasons, we urge you to vote NO on H.R. 5377.

Sincerely,

BRENT GARDNER,
Chief Government Affairs Officer,
Americans for Prosperity.

[From the National Taxpayers Union, Dec. 19, 2019]

National Taxpayers Union urges all Representatives to vote "NO" on H.R. 5377, the "Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act." This legislation would undo some of the many benefits of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (TCJA), raise taxes on small businesses across the country, and add to the complexity of the federal tax code.

Enacted in 2017, the TCJA made several important changes to the individual side of the federal tax code. By significantly reducing income tax rates and increasing the standard deduction, the tax code is fairer and simpler than before. TCJA rightly reformed many deductions and credits to reduce the complexity of the tax code, notably by capping the State and Local Tax (SALT) deduction. Prior to tax reform, the tax code allowed taxpayers to deduct an unlimited amount of state and income and property taxes from their federal tax liability. As a result, many low-tax states were forced to subsidize the choices of high tax states.

This legislation, however, would reverse these positive alterations to the tax code by increasing the top marginal tax rate, lowering the threshold for which this rate kicks

in, and scrapping the cap on the SALT deduction. Most concerning, the effects of uncapping SALT would disproportionately benefit the wealthiest of our society. According to IRS data from tax year 2015, over 84 percent of the benefit of the SALT deduction went towards those with incomes above \$100,000. A mere 3.5 percent went to those with income levels below \$50,000. While some middle class taxpayers would see benefit from this change, nearly all the benefit would be for those at the very top of the income scale.

Ensuring all taxpayers keep more of their hard earned dollars was a priority of the TCJA, which is why only one percent of taxpayers paid more in tax under the reformed tax system. However, giving a tax break to the wealthiest among us, paid for by an increase in the tax liability of small businesses, is not a good use of taxpayer dollars. Many states have adopted pro-taxpayer reforms due to TCJA and the SALT cap, so we should not reverse course now.

Roll call votes on H.R. 5377 will be significantly-weighted in NTU's annual Rating of Congress and a "NO" vote will be considered the pro-taxpayer position.

[From Heritage Action for America, Dec. 18, 2019]

CONGRESS SHOULD REJECT HANDOUTS FOR HIGH-TAX STATE

WASHINGTON.—Heritage Action released the following statement from Executive Director Tim Chapman:

The tax bill House Democrats have put on the schedule this week claims to promote fairness in the tax code, but it really promotes the interest of liberal states. It is anything but fair. It will only benefit a minority of Americans at the expense of those who have chosen to live in states with smaller tax burdens. SALT deductions are nothing more than a federal subsidy for high state and local taxes, which in turn makes individuals in lowtax states responsible for subsidizing more expensive governments elsewhere.

With the backdrop of partisan impeachment, House Democratic leadership is desperate to hand legislative "wins" to their members who represent purple districts. House Republicans should not give them any cover on this bill. It is nothing but a subsidy to the most liberal states at the expense of the rest of the country. Americans should be treated equally.

PARITY FOR MAIN
STREET EMPLOYERS,
December 10, 2019.

Hon. RICHIE NEAL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means, House
of Representatives,
Washington DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL: The Parity for Main Street Employers coalition has serious concerns with the "Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act" to be considered by the House Ways and Means Committee tomorrow.

Individually and family owned businesses organized as S corporations, partnerships and sole proprietorships are the heart of the American economy. They employ the majority of workers, and they contribute the most to our national income. They also pay the majority of business taxes. A recent study by EY found that pass-through businesses pay 51 percent of all business income taxes.

The legislation introduced today would raise these taxes by 1) increasing the top rate passthrough businesses pay from the current 37 percent to 39.6 percent and 2) lowering the income threshold of the top rate from \$622,050 to \$496,600 (Joint) for the years

2020 through 2025, after which the 37 percent rate is scheduled to expire under current law.

This rate hike would be used to offset relief from the SALT deduction cap, including one year of marriage penalty relief (2020) and two years of full relief from the cap (2021 and 2022). While this SALT relief will benefit some pass-through businesses, those savings will be reserved only for businesses residing in certain states, while the tax hike will apply to businesses in all fifty states.

It would also undo a critical balance achieved in tax reform. The lower individual income tax rates coupled with the 20-percent pass-through deduction was designed to maintain tax parity for passthrough businesses and the new 21-percent corporate rate. EY recently reported that tax reform largely succeeded in this balancing act, but only if the deduction and the lower individual tax rates stay in place.

The Parity for Main Street Employers coalition represents millions of individually and family owned businesses employing tens of millions of private sector workers in every community and every industry, including contractors, engineers, retailers, wholesaler-distributors, manufacturers and more. On behalf of these employers, we ask that you reconsider this legislation.

Sincerely,

American Council of Engineering Companies, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors of America, Independent Community Bankers of America, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Electrical Contractors Association, National Federation of Independent Business, National Roofing Contractors Association, S Corporation Association, Wine and Spirits Wholesalers of America.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), an expert on tax policy.

□ 1430

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, today, I rise in strong opposition to this partisan bill that would give millionaires and billionaires a tax cut and do nothing to help the middle class.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act brought prosperity throughout the Nation and to people of every demographic and every income level.

Unemployment is at 50-year lows, all-time lows for African Americans and Hispanics. American economic growth remains the envy of the world.

After years of stagnation under the Obama administration, middle-class wages are growing at rates not seen in over a decade. Opportunity has been restored in this land of opportunity.

How did the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act accomplish all this? Primarily, it cut tax rates for businesses to make them more competitive in the world, especially small businesses that employ two-thirds of American workers.

H.R. 5377 eliminates the \$10,000 cap on the deductibility of State and local taxes, referred to as the SALT deduction, and pays for it by raising the top rate from 37 percent to 39.6 percent. This, however, is the rate paid by many of the small business owners that employ all of those Americans and restored our prosperity. This would abso-

lutely make those businesses less competitive in the world and would dampen America's renewed prosperity.

Madam Speaker, even worse, the \$10,000 cap on deductibility of the SALT deduction is more than sufficient for over 90 percent of Americans. Lifting this \$10,000 cap is a plain tax cut for the rich.

The Democrats' constant complaint about the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is that it was a tax cut for the rich, which is simply untrue. But today, they propose to fix it by giving an even bigger, massive tax cut to the rich. That is correct, and let me repeat it. They complain that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was a tax cut for the rich, and they want to fix it by giving an even bigger tax cut to the rich.

Fifty-two percent of the benefit of repealing the SALT cap goes to income earners making more than \$1 million a year, 52 percent. Ninety-four percent of the benefit goes to income earners in the top 10 percent of wage earners.

Madam Speaker, the Democrats should stop trying to convince America that they care about the middle class. There is an old proverb: I can't hear what you are saying because your actions speak so loudly.

This legislation would be particularly bad for poor and rural areas in States with low taxes, like Florida and Texas, which have no State income taxes. The average SALT deduction in my home county is \$1,800, well below the \$10,000 cap.

We had a hearing where we invited mayors of affluent townships around D.C. and in New York State. Their complaint was that, without the SALT deduction, they would have difficulty in raising taxes on their residents.

Madam Speaker, the D.C. suburbs have the highest household income in the country. The median household income is over \$100,000. I represent Marion County, South Carolina, one of the poorest in the State. Fifty-seven percent of its residents are African American. The median household income is around \$30,000, less than a third of that in the Washington suburbs.

If this SALT cap is lifted, the income taxes that the poor residents of Marion County pay, a portion of those will go to subsidize the housing and the services of the well-paid bureaucrats in the suburbs of D.C.

Their taxes are already used to pay the salaries of these folks, but now you would have the poor rural residents across America, not just Marion County, subsidize their taxes, as well.

Madam Speaker, yesterday, those across the aisle voted to impeach President Trump, who has done more to rebuild the middle class than anyone since Ronald Reagan. The figures don't lie. Today, they introduce a bill that would give a massive tax break to the highest wage earners.

This bill would make our tax code more regressive. It would provide a huge tax benefit to the 1 percent. This benefit would increase income inequality. The Democrats' actions, Madam

Speaker, betray their loyalties, and those loyalties are not to the American middle class.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to think of American workers and vote “no” on this legislation that will hurt the middle class.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out that our bill is paid for, unlike the TCJA, and the payoff comes from the wealthiest earners.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), a great member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly support this bill. I thank the gentleman for his efforts, and especially BILL PASCRELL, who has been our passionate leader on the Ways and Means Committee, for his efforts on this very important issue.

What a spirit of Christmas is upon us today. It is great to see the bipartisanship is continuing. I was so happy to see PETER KING down in the well, talking about what this means.

I dare say, to my other colleagues, I would love to have Mr. RICE come and visit Augie & Ray’s in East Hartford and have him talk about how billionaires are being benefited.

In Connecticut, we used to deduct, on average, \$19,000 in personal property taxes. Now, we get to deduct \$10,000. Why? So that we could pay 1 percent of the Nation 83 percent of your tax cut, which is unpaid for, paid for by working people.

In our State, we send more money to the Federal Government than we get in return.

The basic unfairness, established by Lincoln back during the Civil War, is that this is double taxation and especially hurts the blue-collar workforce all across this great country, especially in those States that go out of their way to pay their own.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. I remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I might add that Nebraska, the State that I represent, actually is considered to be a donor State, as well, and there is great support for the SALT cap in Nebraska.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, to my friends here, I wasn’t going to come up here and try to do firebrand or the theater, but we do have a little moment of intellectual inconsistency. Let’s try a quick thought experiment.

We, as a body, my brothers and sisters on the left, you support a progressive tax system, right?

Well, Madam Speaker, if you support a progressive tax system, then the fact of the matter is, if you have a high-income earning State community, you pay more taxes. It is just a little line of intellectual consistency.

So, you support the wealthier paying more. What happens when you have a deduction that you want to put back?

I am sorry, but you know me and charts; it is a problem. I am working on a 12-step group to deal with it.

The fact of the matter is, the top 5 percent of income earners get 77 percent of the benefit. You can’t intellectually have it both ways. I mean, aren’t your brains just exploding, saying: Well, on the one hand, we want you to give rich people these deductions, but on the other hand, we want to tax rich people more, except for this bill where we want to give the really, really rich people the benefit.

You are going to get a chance. We are going to have an MTR. At least, this way, you can take it away from the really, really, really, really, really rich people who make \$100 million or more, saying they don’t get to take the SALT deduction. We will see what level of super-rich people we are defending in this debate.

I understand, from a political standpoint, you are doing the right thing. You are doing the work from your district. But at least we could be intellectually honest about the math.

If you represent a district that has high taxes, whether it be the income taxes or property taxes, coming and defending SALT is fine. It makes sense. But be honest about what the math means. If you are a donor State, it is because you have high incomes. If you want this, it is because you are defending your wealthy.

It is just math, and the math, Madam Speaker, always wins.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman’s hard work on this.

This is the largest transfer of wealth in American history with the tax bill of the Republicans. They kept the tax breaker for corporations and they are hitting middle class families in my district. Four in ten average about \$15,000 a year.

But one of the things we haven’t talked about is the hit to home values.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article by Allan Sloan in Fortune magazine that talks about Trump’s trillion dollar hit to homeowners.

TRUMP’S TRILLION-DOLLAR HIT TO HOMEOWNERS

By reducing deductions for real estate taxes, Trump’s 2017 tax plan has harmed millions—and helped give corporations a \$680 billion gift.

(by Allan Sloan)

In recent weeks, President Donald Trump has been talking about plans for, as he put it, a “very substantial tax cut for middle income folks who work so hard.” But before Congress embarks on a new tax measure,

people should consider one of the largely unexamined effects of the last tax bill, which Trump promised would help the middle class: Would you believe it has inflicted a trillion dollars of damage on homeowners—many of them middle class—throughout the country?

That massive number is the reduction in home values caused by the 2017 tax law that capped federal deductions for state and local real estate and income taxes at \$10,000 a year and also eliminated some mortgage interest deductions. The impact varies widely across different areas. Counties with high home prices and high real estate taxes and where homeowners have big mortgages are suffering the biggest hit, as you’d expect, given the larger value of the lost tax deductions. But as we’ll see, homeowners all over the country are feeling the effects.

I’m basing my analysis on numbers from two well-respected people: Mark Zandi, the chief economist of Moody’s Analytics; and Hugh Lamle, the retired president of M.D. Sass, a Wall Street investment management company.

Zandi’s numbers are broad—macro-math, as it were. Lamle (pronounced LAM-lee) is a master of micro-math. It was Lamle who first got me thinking about home value losses by sending me an economic model that he created to show the damage inflicted on high-end, high-bracket taxpayers in high-tax areas who paid seven digits or more for their homes.

Lamle starts with the premise that homebuyers have typically figured out how much house they can afford by calculating how much they can spend on a down payment and monthly mortgage payment, adjusting the latter by the amount they’d save via the tax deduction for mortgage interest and real estate taxes. His model figures out how much prices would have to drop for the same monthly payment to cover a given house now that this notional buyer can’t take advantage of the real estate tax deduction and might not be able to take full advantage of the mortgage interest deduction.

After I showed Lamle’s model to my ProPublica research partner, Doris Burke, she steered me to Zandi’s research, which I realized could be used to calculate national value-loss numbers.

Ready? Here we go. The broad picture first, then the specific. This gets a little complicated, so please bear with me.

Zandi says that because of the 2017 tax law, U.S. house prices overall are about 4% lower than they’d otherwise be. The next question is how many dollars of lost home value that 4% translates into. That isn’t so hard to figure out if you get your hands on the right numbers.

Let me show you.

The Federal Reserve Board says that as of March 31, U.S. home values totaled about \$26.1 trillion. Apply Zandi’s 4% number to that, and you end up with a \$1.04 trillion setback for the nation’s home owners. That’s right—a trillion, with a T.

Please note that Zandi isn’t saying that house prices have fallen by an average of 4%. That hasn’t happened. What he’s saying is that on average, house prices are about 4% lower than they’d otherwise be.

Given that the Fed statistics show that homeowners’ equity was \$15.76 trillion as of March 31, Zandi’s numbers imply that homeowners’ equity is down about 6.6% from where it would otherwise be. (That’s the \$1.04 trillion value loss divided by the \$15.76 trillion of equity.)

This is a very big deal to families whose biggest financial asset is the equity they have in their homes. And there are untold millions of families in that situation.

While Zandi and I were having the first of several phone conversations, he sent me a

county-by-county list of the estimated home-price damage done to about 3,000 counties throughout the country. I was fascinated—and appalled—to see that the biggest estimated value loss in percentage terms, 11.3%, was in Essex County, New Jersey, the New York City suburb where I live.

In case you're interested—or just snoopy—the four other counties that make up the five biggest-losers list are: Westchester County, New York, suburban New York City, 11.1%; Union County, New Jersey, which is adjacent to Essex County, 11.0%; New York County, the New York City borough of Manhattan, 10.4%; and Lake County, Illinois, suburban Chicago, 9.9%.

You can find Zandi's county-by-county list in our Data Store. Eyeball the list, and you'll see that counties throughout the country have home values lower than they would otherwise be.

Here's how it works. Zandi took what financial techies call the "present value" of the property tax and mortgage interest deductions that homeowners will lose over seven years (the average duration of a mortgage) because of changes in the tax law and subtracted it from the value of the typical house. That results in a 3% decline in national home values below what they would otherwise be.

The remaining one percentage point of value shrinkage, Zandi says, comes from the higher interest rates that he says will result from higher federal budget deficits caused by the tax bill. He estimates that rates on 10-year Treasury notes, a key benchmark for mortgage rates, will be 0.2% higher than they would otherwise be, which in turn will make mortgage rates 0.2% higher.

Even though interest rates on 10-year Treasury notes are at or near record lows as I write this, they would be even lower if the Treasury were borrowing less than it's currently borrowing to cover the higher federal budget deficits caused by Trump's tax bill.

If Zandi's interest-rate take is correct—it's true by definition, if you believe in the law of supply and demand—even homeowners who aren't affected by the inability to deduct all their real estate taxes and mortgage interest costs are affected by the tax bill.

How so? Because higher interest rates for buyers translate into lower prices for sellers and therefore produce lower values for owners.

You can argue, as some people do, that real estate taxes should never have been deductible because allowing that deduction is bad economic policy that inflated home prices and favored higher-income people over lower-income people.

But even if you believe that, there's no question that eliminating the deduction for millions of homeowners inflicted serious financial damage on homeowners who had no warning that a major tax deduction that they were used to getting would be wiped out.

As a result, homebuyers who had taken the value of the real estate tax deduction into account when buying their homes had their home values and finances whacked without warning. Interest deductions on mortgage borrowings exceeding \$750,000 were cut back, compared with interest deductions on up to \$1 million under the old law—but that doesn't affect anywhere near as many people as the cap on real estate tax deductions does.

(A brief aside: Among the modest winners here are first-time buyers who purchased their homes after the tax law took effect and benefited by paying less than they would have paid under the old tax rules.)

Now, to the micro-math.

Lamle's model isn't applicable to most people because it works only for taxpayers with a household income of at least \$200,000

a year who paid at least \$1 million for their homes. But the principle underlying Lamle's model applies to everyone who owns a home or is interested in owning one. To wit: You calculate the tax-law-caused loss of value by figuring out how much a house's price needs to fall for buyers' or owners' after-tax costs to be the same now as they were before the tax law changed.

"People buying large-ticket items typically focus on after-tax costs of ownership," Lamle told me. "The amount that many buyers can afford is affected by limits on their financial resources. Therefore, as their tax costs increase substantially because of the loss of tax deductions, they have less money available to pay for homes and to take on mortgage debt."

At the suggestion of one of my editors, I asked Lamle to use a modified version of his economic model to estimate the tax law's impact on the value of a theoretical house in the New York City suburb of West Orange, New Jersey, purchased for \$800,000 in 2017 by a theoretical family with a \$250,000 annual income. Those home value and income numbers are very high by national standards—but middle class by the standards of large parts of suburban Essex County.

Real estate tax on that theoretical house would run about \$28,900 a year, according to statistics from the New Jersey state treasurer's office. That tax used to be fully deductible for federal tax purposes. Now, it's not deductible at all if you assume that the house's owners are taking the standard deduction on their federal returns. Or that even if they're itemizing deductions, they're paying at least \$10,000 of state income taxes, which means they don't get any benefit from deducting property taxes.

According to Lamle's calculations, this inability to deduct real estate tax has reduced the home's value by \$138,720, assuming a 5% mortgage rate. At a 4% rate, the value loss is \$173,400. (For the math and assumptions underlying these numbers, see his methodology below.) So if the family put up \$200,000—25% of the purchase price—to buy the house, more than half of that investment has been wiped out.

Obviously, it's impossible to prove that Zandi and Lamle are right about the impact they say the tax law is having (and will continue to have) on home prices, because there's no way to gauge the accuracy of their numbers. But the logic is compelling.

The loss in home values is crucial because it turns out that lots more people have bigger financial stakes in their houses than in their stock portfolios, which have thrived as the Trump tax law turbocharged corporate earnings and stock prices.

In fact, 73.5% of households that own homes, stocks or both had bigger stakes in the home market than in the stock market, according to David Rasnick, an economist at the Center for Economic and Policy Research, who parsed Federal Reserve data at my request.

Now, let's put things in perspective, set aside home value losses for a minute and talk about the cash that people are getting from Trump's 2017 tax law. It isn't all that much for most families. Households' average federal income tax has fallen by \$1,260 a year, according to the Tax Policy Center. That average is skewed by big savings realized by people with big incomes; the median family's tax cut is only about half as much as the average cut, by the Tax Policy Center's math.

This means that—for taxpayers of higher income and more modest income—the income tax savings are likely small beer compared with the hidden loss inflicted on many of them by lower house values.

Back to the main event. And some final—but important—numbers.

According to the Tax Policy Center, the Treasury will get \$620 billion of additional revenue over a 10-year period because people can't deduct their full state and local taxes.

That, in turn, covers most of the 10-year, \$680 billion cost of the income tax break that corporations are getting. So you can make a case that my friends and neighbors and co-workers in New York and New Jersey—and many of you all over the country—are paying more federal income tax in order to help corporations pay less federal income tax.

That, my friends, is the bottom line.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. By denying the full SALT deduction, you are making it more expensive to buy homes, you are having a lower resale value, it is a loss of net worth, plus there is about a 1 percent hit because of the higher interest rates that are going to come because your tax bill of \$2 trillion is on the collar.

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to look at this to see how pervasive the hit is, not just to their income tax, but to their most precious asset, their home value.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a leader and a very vocal advocate of this bill.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5377.

The bill is a carefully crafted and balanced package of tax relief created to address the injustice done to our middle-class families by the SALT cap.

Remember, if you are rich, you get double taxed. If you are not so rich, you get double taxed.

That is what we are talking about here. It is the product of months of hard work by members of our committee and the working group led by Mr. THOMPSON.

I thank the gentleman from California for the time he spent on this and for not giving up. I am grateful to our many other colleagues from other States, blue and red. I also thank our committee chair, the gentleman from Massachusetts, for his leadership and hard work. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I am going to conclude with this, Madam Speaker. They have only talked about one side—the other side has done this—about what happens to those "millionaires" if, in the bill, we pay for it by increasing the personal income tax from 37 percent to 39 percent, from where it was before.

Have you subtracted that from what you are going to get back on their taxes? No, you haven't, because you have done it in a dishonest way.

That is why the middle class gets shafted. Not this time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to

the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a great member of our Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, my congressional district is one of the most affected congressional districts in the Nation, ranking 38 among districts in highest average SALT deductions. Over 105,000 households benefited from SALT in my district in 2017, with an average benefit of \$19,400. Then the Republican tax law increased taxes on millions of Illinoisans and tens of millions of Americans.

The SALT deduction is a bedrock part of the tax code since its inception. It has been around since the beginning of time.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it. We need to restore it and make sure that citizens get the benefit in their communities from their State government and then be able to use it as a part of their income tax.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), a treasured member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, there are many issues with the Republican tax scheme, but the \$10,000 State and local tax deduction cap is one of the most egregious. The SALT deduction has been a fixture of the United States tax code since the introduction of the Federal income tax in 1913 to acknowledge that State and local taxes are paid for services that the Federal Government does not provide.

When State and local governments lost part of that deduction, they were taxed twice, so this is an issue, which has been said many times in the committee, of tax fairness.

While this legislation was a team effort under the direction of MIKE THOMPSON, head of the working group, the persistence of Members BILL PASCRELL and TOM SUOZZI, who made their persistence with clarity and insistence on fairness for their constituents, inspired all of us to fight to defend that same fairness for ours.

This is a good bill. I urge its support.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a great member of our Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5377, which will stop the double taxing of millions of Americans.

Restoring the ability of Americans to deduct their State and local taxes is about fairness. It is about fairness for the households in my California dis-

trict, where the average SALT deduction was nearly \$21,000, more than double the current \$10,000 limit.

It is about fairness for the married teachers making \$60,000 each, who now receive only half of the deduction of unmarried couples, effectively creating a marriage penalty.

It is about fairness for our local governments that struggle to provide important services such as education, public safety, and infrastructure.

And it is about fairness for our teachers and firefighters who get an additional deduction in this bill to help them afford work-related expenses.

The 2017 tax scam was unfair. The top 1 percent and corporations got a massive handout, while American families were left holding the bag.

A vote in support of this bill today begins to restore that fairness, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), a great member of our Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for recognizing me.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. This legislation seeks to fix one of the most harmful provisions of the 2017 Republican tax law: the \$10,000 limit on the State and local tax deduction.

Raising this unfair, punishing cap is a top priority for the constituents I represent. Forcing Americans to pay Federal tax on the taxes they have already paid to their State and local government is double taxation and it is wrong.

In my Illinois district, approximately 42 percent of filers use the SALT deduction, and the average deduction is significantly higher, nearly double the new cap. Even worse, the new \$10,000 cap applies equally to married and single filers, creating a marriage penalty, further punishing joint filers. This is not fair to America's middle class.

It is wrong that the burden of the tax law that overwhelmingly benefits the most fortunate Americans—indeed, 83 percent of the benefit of the 2017 law went to the top 1 percent—it is unfair that the burden should lie in a narrow range of States like Illinois.

H.R. 5377 would rectify these wrongs. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI), someone who has worked tirelessly on this. You couldn't get out of his line of sight. No matter how early I went to the gym, the gentleman would be waiting: "We have got to do SALT."

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman THOMPSON, Chairman NEAL, and BILL PASCRELL for all of their hard work. I thank PETER KING, my Republican colleague from Long Island who is retiring next year, who is standing up for his constituents, as he always has. I thank the 50 cosponsors of this bill, bipartisan cosponsors, who realize that we have to be, as someone mentioned before, intellectually honest.

We need to be intellectually honest and recognize, number one, that 100 percent of this bill is paid for by the wealthiest Americans. One hundred percent of this bill is paid for by taxpayers who make over \$440,000 a year. It is inaccurate to suggest that other people are subsidizing this other than the wealthy. This is being paid for 100 percent by the wealthy.

This is called the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. That name is exactly what this is about: restoring fairness.

It is not fair. It is not fair that people are paying taxes on taxes they have already paid. It is not fair to State and local municipalities that relied on this tax deduction since the beginning of the tax code in 1913 that are now getting a punch in the gut and trying to change the rules.

There is a reason that this has been endorsed by so many different groups. It has been endorsed by teachers. It has been endorsed by firefighters, by police officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, it has been endorsed by the U.S. Conference of Mayors. It has been endorsed by the National League of Cities, endorsed by the National Association of Counties.

It is not fair, Madam Speaker, that my colleagues on the other side are boasting that people are leaving places like my State and moving to their States.

What happens? The people who are left behind, low-and moderate-income people who can't afford to move away, get left behind holding the bag.

My State and so many other States that are hurt by this existing GOP tax cut are subsidizing the other States in this Nation. My State sends \$48 billion a year more to the Federal Government than we get back.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please support this.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 14-¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to

the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), a great member of our committee.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity to rise and speak in support of the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act, which includes my bill, the Support American Teachers Act of 2019, which will substantially increase the current educators' deduction expense for teachers.

On average, teachers in Clark County School District, the fifth largest district in the country, which I represent, spend about \$750 out of pocket on school supplies for their classrooms. The starting year salary for those teachers is \$40,000.

Kaitlyn Cline, a kindergarten teacher at Kay Carl Elementary School, also in Las Vegas, spends even more. Every year, Kaitlyn spends about \$1,000 out of her own pocket to give her class the educational experience they deserve.

As Ms. Cline says:

As a teacher, I have to work extra hard on the side to help pay my bills and have extra money for work expenses. Any extra financial relief that can be utilized, can make a huge difference.

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill. Let's give the teachers the support they need and provide them the deduction for the expenses that they incur.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I would just add that there will be a chance here in a few moments to answer the concerns that the prior speaker had, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. ESHOO), a treasured member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 5377 and am an original cosponsor of this legislation.

I am going to put my full statement in the RECORD, but let me just say a few things that are top-line—top-line—for my constituents. There are over 200,000 constituents' households affected by this in my congressional district.

Now, someone was talking about math. I think the original tax bill was bad math. It charged \$2 trillion to the national debt.

Fair? No. It was an assault on the middle class. Let's be perfectly clear about this.

And what has the middle class done to anyone here? They are the backbone of our country. They have four major things to deduct: mortgage interest, SALT, charitable deductions, and health expenditures.

So what did the Republicans' tax bill do? It screwed the middle class, in plain English.

So this restores that deductibility, and they deserve to have it.

This bill is paid for. I think that is good math, and I think it is fair.

I thank Mr. THOMPSON and the committee for the work that they have done on it. Bravo to all of you, and thank you from my constituents.

Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 5377, I rise in strong support of the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

This legislation repeals the harmful cap on the State and Local Tax (SALT) Deduction in 2020 and 2021 and fixes the marriage penalty in 2019 by doubling the SALT cap to \$20,000 for married couples.

This is welcome relief to the nearly 200,000 of my constituents and the millions of Americans who are no longer able to deduct the full amount of State and Local Taxes they pay each year.

The 2017 Republican tax bill took a sledgehammer to the SALT deduction by capping it at \$10,000 annually for both single filers and married couples, essentially an assault on the middle class, the backbone of our country.

The SALT deduction is one of the few deductions in the federal tax code that middle class families depend on, along with deductions for medical expenses, charitable contributions, and mortgage interest.

Prior to this harmful cap, my constituents claimed an average annual SALT deduction of \$63,083 in 2017. More than half of all taxpayers in my district claimed this credit in 2017, and half of these taxpayers earned between \$75,000 and \$100,000.

This legislation also doubles the educator expense deduction for teachers and creates a new deduction for first responders for uniforms, tuition and professional development.

These hardworking and dedicated professionals are part of the foundation of our local communities and they deserve this much-needed tax relief.

I urge my colleagues to vote YES on H.R. 5377.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, in the interest of accuracy in this debate, I would like to reiterate that we doubled the standard deduction for all Americans—not just selective groups, but all Americans. We doubled that standard deduction, therefore, helping the middle class, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 5377, to begin to repair some of the damage from the GPO's tax scam legislation which passed this House 2 years ago.

I said it at the time, and I say it again: It is one of the worst bills I have ever seen, and it blows a hole in the budget.

So much for fiscal responsibility on the other side of the aisle.

One of the more egregious provisions in that bill was capping State and local tax deductions at \$10,000. This deduction has been part of our tax code for over 150 years.

This cap hurts my constituents, who often have property, income, and sales taxes exceeding \$10,000.

New Yorkers already pay more to the Federal Government as a donor State

than we receive back. We receive only 84 cents for every dollar we send to Washington. This imbalance is greater than any other State and grows because of the SALT cap. Homeowners are already seeing home values decline because of the SALT cap.

Earlier in this year, I introduced H.R. 515, with 20 of my colleagues, to repeal this harmful tax provision. I am pleased to see my New York colleague Mr. SUOZZI's measure containing much of my bill here on the floor today.

In conclusion, let me say we need to reverse some of the harm the GPO's tax scam bill has inflicted on so many Americans, especially my New York constituents. Support H.R. 5377, and let's be fair once and for all.

□ 1500

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON).

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I want to first commend my colleague from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) for his passionate advocacy for his district. I understand where his heart is, I understand his motives, I know they are pure, and it makes it a lot easier to work with people who approach public policy that way.

But as I have mentioned to him in committee, I think this is wrongheaded and fundamentally bad public policy. It certainly is not in keeping with benefiting the general welfare of the public, restoring these SALT deductions. I am sure many of these points being made earlier discourage localities and States from keeping their taxes low. They also penalize States like Texas who keep their tax rates low, and the majority of the benefit of these deductions will go to millionaires. That is not an exaggeration. Over 50 percent of the benefit will go to people who are millionaires. In fact, 95 percent of the benefit will go to folks who make over \$200,000. That is real money in west Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Madam Speaker, I think one of the biggest problems I have with this, ultimately, is we are raising that top rate after we cut taxes, restored more freedom to the markets, and unleashed growth and job creation, all a tremendous response from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and now we are putting a tax burden on the American people.

We are raising taxes on small businesses. One-third of the taxes being raised here will fall on small businesses, mom-and-pop shops, community banks, and family farmers. Main Street will be negatively affected in a big way.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CASTEN).

Mr. CASTEN of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5377.

I want to start by thanking my colleagues across the aisle for passing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. My predecessor campaigned on it, and I wouldn't be here otherwise, so I thank them all.

It is important to understand we need to pass this bill to undo the damage done by that bill and the hurt it gave to middle-class families, teachers, and first responders across the country. From the very first tax code in 1913, we have included allowing a deduction for State and local taxes for the simple reason that we shouldn't tax people twice.

It is not just going back to 1913. Our Founders got that point as well. Alexander Hamilton in *Federalist* 32 wrote that independent and uncontrollable authority to raise their own revenues for the supply of their own wants would be a problem.

What Hamilton understood is that certain services—roads, schools, fire departments, and libraries—are better and more efficiently provided by local authorities, and when we double taxation, we create a fight between Federal and local authorities for finite resources to the detriment of those critical local services.

Repeat the State and local tax deduction in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “yes”.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PHILLIPS).

Mr. PHILLIPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5377, the bipartisan Restoring Tax Fairness to States and Localities Act, legislation that will provide immediate relief to American families.

Elimination of the State and local tax deduction in the 2017 tax law was a bad deal for the State of Minnesota, the people of my district, and millions across the country. In fact, the SALT cap is a punishment for States that invest in schools, roads, and people, and it is punishment to hardworking families in those States who deserve our appreciation and gratitude—not a tax increase.

Matthew and Karen are two educators in my district who bought a home for their young family just 3 years ago. Now, with the increased tax burden, they face the real prospect of losing their home and having to move farther away from their kids' school and community.

I am fighting hard for this bill, and I am on a mission to make the tax code more equitable for the people of my State—one that already shares much more of its hard-earned money with Washington than it gets back in return—and particularly for people like Matthew and Karen.

So, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to

come together to end the SALT cap and repeal such a punitive mistake.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support for the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

Over the last year, I have heard a resounding message from Orange County families, from Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike. We must repeal the harmful SALT limits included in Trump's tax law.

When that law capped State and local tax deductions, it raised taxes on tens of thousands of Orange County families.

The average SALT deduction in my district is over \$22,000, and by capping the deduction at only \$10,000—less than half that amount—Orange County families are being double taxed on the money they earned. The SALT cap also imposes a marriage penalty, and it is, therefore, antifamily.

Reversing SALT is bipartisan. I heard this in April when I held a tax townhall in April. My constituents simply could not understand why Republicans and Democrats could not come together to address the SALT problem and help middle-class families in California while Halliburton, Amazon, and Chevron paid no Federal income tax in 2018.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman an additional 20 seconds.

Ms. PORTER. Our families should not be penalized by double taxation.

I thank Chairmen Neal and Thompson for their work on this important bill, and I urge support from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

First off, I do want to thank my colleague from Long Island, Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. SUOZZI and I have engaged in many conversations about this important issue, and I am sure that that will continue after today's debate.

I would like to clear up a few things about this legislation before us today to cut through some of what has been debated.

This bill permanently hikes taxes on individuals and small businesses to 39.6 percent for those currently in the 37 percent tax bracket—and for many in the 35 percent tax bracket as well—in exchange for a very temporary change of the SALT deduction only until 2021. So the SALT deduction is going to change very temporarily, but permanently we are going to be increasing taxes on individuals and small businesses.

We have to understand that 90 percent of U.S. businesses are passthroughs. They don't pay the corporate tax rate. They pay under the individual tax rate. Almost 100 percent of all passthrough businesses have less than 100 employees. We are increasing taxes permanently on all these small businesses in exchange for that short-term change.

I support multiple active bills that would change the State and local tax deduction without raising any taxes on individuals and small businesses. It is important to remember that the only SALT deduction legislation that will ever provide relief is legislation that can be signed into law, and this bill which permanently raises taxes on individuals and small businesses is not it.

In my district, from Main Street to wineries on the North Fork, this is bad news for small businesses up and down Long Island. I am focused on providing true tax relief for all hardworking Long Islanders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ZELDIN. It is unfortunate that, at the end of the day, when the dust has settled, they will continue to be the victims of out-of-State and out-of-touch congressional leadership putting politics over commonsense, realistic solutions.

My colleagues know I am eager to work with them to fix this legislation, so we can actually get this across the finish line and signed into law to provide true tax relief for hardworking Americans. But, unfortunately, that very temporary change to SALT in exchange for that permanent tax increase for individuals and small businesses is why I can't support this bill in its current form.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I just want to remind the gentleman that, although I appreciate that he wants to get rid of the cap, you can't do it without paying for it. That is the same irresponsible behavior that the Republicans employed in their tax bill, and it cost us \$2.3 trillion in our national debt.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5377 to finally deliver the tax cuts so desperately needed for families and businesses in my district in northern New Jersey.

I thank Chairman NEAL for his leadership on this legislation which will ultimately save the Fifth District tax filers \$5.6 billion each year. That is just in my district alone.

Today, I released a tax cut model to show, at every income level, the massive tax cuts that families in the Fifth Congressional District of New Jersey will see as a result of this bipartisan bill. Not only will this bill cut taxes,

but it also helps increase our property values and drives economic growth, which is why the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce and the New Jersey Realtors have both come out in support of the legislation.

We have to fix the mess caused by the 2017 tax hike bill in the moocher States and provide actual tax cuts for New Jersey families, first responders, and small businesses.

Ever since I joined Democrats and Republicans in voting against the tax hike bill, I have been fighting to fully reinstate SALT and finally cut taxes for north Jersey families. It is time we fought back against the moocher States who literally stole \$800 billion right out of our pockets. I am sick and tired of paying the bill of the moocher States. This is a huge win for New Jersey families and an actual tax cut.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I would remind my colleague who just spoke that the average family of four in his district received a benefit through the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of about \$5,000 per year.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, last night we were in the twilight zone, and now we are in a parallel universe today. Very interesting what we are doing here.

I come from the high-tax State of California, where we bear the cost of so many tax increases from Sacramento. So all we are doing here is justifying the increase in the car tax, the increase in the gas tax, and spending the money on a dead high-speed rail project, the increase from a mysterious gas tax, and the cap-and-trade tax.

All we are going to do here is reward bad behavior in California and five or six other high-tax States.

Instead, let's get back on track with doing things that cause jobs to happen, as the bill that our Democrat colleagues don't like. They didn't like Proposition 13, which has saved homes in California. They have been complaining about it ever since it was passed.

Now they are trying to eviscerate Prop 13 and raise taxes on businesses. This will justify that ability to do that. Don't send a message that they can raise taxes in California or other States any more by what happens in this place.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the State of Virginia (Ms. WEXTON).

Ms. WEXTON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

The SALT deduction has protected Virginia taxpayers from double taxation for over 100 years, but that changed when Donald Trump and congressional Republicans imposed an un-

precedented \$10,000 tax cap punishing taxpayers in districts like mine.

In 2017 my district had the highest average SALT deduction in Virginia at almost \$18,000 and the greatest number of households claiming SALT at 213,500—more than half of my district.

The SALT cap is unfair and punitive, hurting Virginians and over 11 million Americans. Hardworking taxpayers deserve better.

Today we have an opportunity to do better, to restore this tax relief and put money back in the pockets of 150,000 households in my district and many, many more across the country.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

□ 1515

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

Mr. ZELDIN. Madam Speaker, I think it is important to reiterate the fact that this bill is just a very temporary change to the SALT deduction until 2021 in exchange for a permanent increase to taxes on individuals in small businesses.

While we are having this debate, I think it is also really important to point out that the reason our State and local tax deduction was as high as it was is because our State and local taxes are as high as they are.

As we take this opportunity on this floor, let's send a message to Mayor de Blasio in New York City, and Governors and State legislators in Albany, New Jersey, and California, that all levels of government have a role to play in tax relief. That is why our State and local tax deduction was as high as it was.

To deliver for my constituents on the east end of Long Island, for people in our entire State, and for Governor Cuomo and the Democrats running Albany right now watching this, do your part. My people in my district are desperate for relief, and Congress shouldn't try to bail you out time and time again.

We will stand here and fight for you. That is why I support multiple bills that will make a change to the State and local tax deduction. But ironically, this is a bill that makes it worse through a temporary change for the SALT deduction in exchange for a permanent tax increase. So now, they are getting screwed both ways.

I am a little different from some of my colleagues. I had some opposition to the bill in 2017, and I am opposed to this bill as well.

For those Democratic politicians who are in New York City and Albany and putting the screws to my constituents because they only know how to raise taxes and they don't know how to spend wisely, start doing your part because that is why our SALT deduction was as high as it was for so long.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to

the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California for yielding.

Madam Speaker, Americans famously complain about taxes. Who can then blame residents of the District of Columbia, where 40 percent claim the SALT deduction, among the largest number of taxpayers in the country? By allowing at least a \$10,000 deduction, the 2017 Republican tax law concedes that it imposes double taxation.

The Republican tax law was particularly nefarious because it virtually targeted blue states, whose top taxes support values like funding for local public education. We cannot, of course, protect Americans from taxes, but ever since the passage of the Federal income tax law in 1913, we have protected them from being taxed on dollars already taxed by State and local governments. The Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act ensures that wisdom.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 5¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Nebraska has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY), the chair of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and for his great leadership.

Madam Speaker, there was a lot wrong with the 2017 Republican tax law. This week, we can fix part of it by repealing the cap on the State and local tax deduction, or SALT.

The SALT deduction allows taxpayers to deduct from their Federal taxes the State and local income property taxes they pay. Republicans capped the SALT deductions at \$10,000, far, far less than many New Yorkers pay. It has caused a great deal of pain for many New Yorker families.

There is also a marriage penalty in the law. So if two people who each have \$10,000 in SALT get married, their combined deduction goes from \$20,000 to \$10,000 when they tie the knot. That doesn't make sense.

The bill before us, H.R. 5377, introduced by my colleague, TOM SUOZZI, addresses both of these issues. It lifts the cap for married couples to \$20,000 in 2019. It eliminates the cap entirely for the following 2 years and pays for it by restoring the previous top marginal tax rate.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5377.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, if there are no other speakers on the other side, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to

close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Madam Speaker, in the interest of spreading holiday cheer, I will be brief.

I believe the bill we are about to vote on is bad policy. If you look at the SALT cap, it is good policy.

A State that has lower taxes should not be forced to pay more to subsidize a State that has higher taxes. There are generally reasons that a State is a higher tax State, and that was generated locally or at that State level.

But I think it is bad policy, as Mr. ZELDIN was pointing out, to have a permanent tax increase to pay for a temporary tax benefit. That is bad policy.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I point out that their provision is temporary as well, just not as temporary.

Madam Speaker, the National Association of Police Organizations in their letter to us wrote: "Our members are not just first responders; they are also citizens of the communities in which they work."

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from that organization.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POLICE
ORGANIZATIONS, INC.

Alexandria, Virginia, December 10, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways and
Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEAL AND RANKING MEMBER BRADY:

On behalf of the National Association of Police Organizations (NAPO), representing over 241,000 sworn law enforcement officers across the nation, I am writing to you to express our full support for the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

Throughout this country, law enforcement officers go to work every day with one goal in mind: to keep their communities safe. In order to achieve this mission, they receive support from the communities they serve, as public safety budgets across the United States are largely drawn from state and local property, sales, and income taxes—essential investments that give our first responders the tools they need to get the job done. The state and local tax (SALT) deduction has helped support these vital investments at the state and local level.

Our members are not just first responders; they are also citizens of the communities in which they work. The fact is that the capping of the SALT deduction is a significant tax increase for many suburban homeowners, including law enforcement officers. This puts them squarely in the range of middle-class taxpayers that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act (Public Law No. 115-97) was supposed to help. Instead, with the SALT deduction capped at \$10,000, many first responders are finding themselves on the wrong end of a tax hike. We support the two-year repeal of the cap

and call on Congress to permanently repeal it, for homeowners, for our communities, and for the first responders who work every day to keep those communities safe.

Further, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act hit law enforcement officers with another tax increase when it eliminated their ability to deduct work-related out-of-pocket expenses. Like many public servants, law enforcement officers serve our nation and our communities for modest wages and often have to pay for mandatory and necessary equipment and training out-of-pocket. These out-of-pocket costs are significant and a financial burden on officers. NAPO supports the inclusion of the Supporting America's First Responders Act, which would reinstate deductions for certain, significant work-related out-of-pocket expenses for first responders.

NAPO stands ready to support any efforts necessary to pass this legislation.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. JOHNSON, CAE,
Executive Director.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, the fact is that capping the SALT deduction is a significant tax increase for many suburban homeowners, including law enforcement officers. This puts them squarely in the range of middle-class taxpayers that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was supposed to help. Instead, with the SALT deduction cap at \$10,000, many first responders are finding themselves on the wrong end of a tax hike.

We support the 2-year repeal of the cap and call on Congress to permanently repeal it for homeowners, for our communities, and for first responders who work every day to keep those communities safe.

Madam Speaker, I want to take a quick moment, as we head into this holiday season, to offer my appreciation to the Committee on Ways and Means tax staff. The Members who serve on the Committee on Ways and Means already know that they have the hardest working men and women on the Hill at their disposal. This bill would not have been possible without their commitment, policy expertise, dedication, and hard work.

I want to take a minute to thank my subcommittee staff director, Aruna Kalyanam; the lead staffer on the SALT deduction, Peg McGlinch; my senior counsel, Terri McField; as well as Scott La Rochelle, Arjun Ghosh, Lee Slater, and Andrew Grossman on the committee for their tremendous efforts. They do great work, and we should all be really glad that they are here. All Americans should be.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I strongly support this legislation to eliminate the cap on the State and Local Tax (or SALT) deduction. Two years ago, Republicans capped the SALT deduction to force districts represented by Democratic Members to pay for the bulk of their Tax Scam. That cap raised over \$662 billion in revenue for Republican tax priorities, nearly all of it from Democratic states like New York. New York State already pays \$48 billion more to the Federal government than it gets back, and the loss of the SALT deduction was responsible for a \$2.3 billion revenue hole in

New York last year putting critical services at risk.

Some of my colleagues claim that the SALT deduction will just benefit the wealthy. Wrong. In 2016, 1.2 million New Yorkers used the SALT deduction, and more than half of those taxpayers earned less than \$100,000 per year. We are not talking about a loophole used by the richest Americans—many of which, I will point out, were preserved in the Republican Tax Scam. We are talking about the largest deduction for the teachers, office workers, and first responders who make up the middle class in my district.

We must remove this cap and stop punishing the hard-working people of New York simply because of where they live. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 772, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rice of South Carolina moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5377 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by section 2(a), insert "if the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for such taxable year does not exceed \$100,000,000," after "January 1, 2020,".

In section 3, strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) SUSPENSION OF DOLLAR LIMITATION ON STATE AND LOCAL TAXES FOR 2020 AND 2021.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in 2020 or 2021, subparagraph (B) of paragraph (6) shall not apply.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if the adjusted gross income of such taxpayer for such taxable year exceeds \$100,000,000.”.

In the matter proposed to be inserted by each of sections 4(a), 4(b)(2), 5(a), and 5(c), strike “\$500” and insert “\$1,000”.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, my motion to recommit is very simple.

Despite the terms of the underlying bill, it would retain the \$10,000 cap on the SALT deduction only for tax returns where the people earn more than \$100 million a year.

This would produce about \$7 billion in savings, and we would apply the \$7 billion to doubling the deduction for firefighters and teachers' supplies from \$500, which is provided in the underlying bill, to \$1,000.

Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle love to say that they are the party of the downtrodden and the middle class, but their actions certainly speak a lot louder than their words. The underlying bill here is a plain giveaway to the rich. Let me say that again: It is a plain giveaway to the rich.

In excess of 50 percent of the benefit of restoring or taking away the SALT cap goes to the top 1 percent of wage earners. Madam Speaker, 94 percent—94 percent—of the benefit of doing away with the SALT cap goes to wage earners that are in the top 10 percent of American wage earners.

Please, Madam Speaker, my friends across the aisle should stop saying that they are for the middle class.

I represent an area in South Carolina. I live in Horry County, South Carolina. The average SALT deduction is \$1,800. The SALT cap of \$10,000 is five times higher than what is needed to cover the average SALT deduction in Horry County.

But I represent poor counties as well. Marion County, South Carolina, 57 percent African American, has an average wage of \$30,000 a year. If we do away with this SALT deduction cap, these people would be subsidizing, with their Federal income taxes, mansions in high-tax States.

That is simply not fair, and it doesn't just apply in South Carolina. It applies to rural areas all over our country, including rural areas in California and rural areas in New York.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act signed into effect 2 years ago has restored opportunity in this land of opportunity. We have historic lows in unemployment. Record numbers of people are working in this country, in every demographic category. It cuts taxes for people at every income level.

The opportunity has been restored in this land of opportunity, but my friends across the aisle dig at this. Their big opposition to this bill is that it was a tax cut for the wealthy. They say 80 percent went to the wealthiest 1 percent. That is not true. That only focuses on the time after the individual tax cuts expire.

Their proposal to fix the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, their proposal to fix this bill that they say is a tax cut for the wealthy, is to put back an even greater tax cut for the wealthy. Again, 94 percent of the benefit of this bill goes to people who earn in the top 10 percent of wage earners in this country.

Madam Speaker, there is an old proverb: I can't hear what you are saying because your actions scream so loudly.

Madam Speaker, if we truly are for the middle class, if we truly are for the downtrodden, if we want to support our firefighters and our teachers, vote for this motion to recommit.

Keep the SALT deduction in place for the wealthiest of the wealthy, only those who are earning \$100 million a year or more. Surely, they can afford to pay for their property taxes on their mansions without subsidies from rural people like the people in Marion, South Carolina.

If we really believe that we want to back the middle class, let's back up our words with actions.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, let's talk about who actually takes the SALT deduction.

In my district in New Jersey, they are not rich. They are teachers. They are firefighters. They are small business owners. They are young families who want to buy a home, seniors who want to stay in theirs.

And then in 2017, House Republicans targeted them because they happen to live in States where we choose to pay for good schools and services.

And why? Not to pay for schools, not to pay for our military, not to pay for our healthcare, but because they needed to find someone in America to pay for cutting our effective corporate tax rate in half.

When middle-class families in my district saw their taxes rise, their home values fall, just one company, Berkshire Hathaway—one company—got a \$29 billion windfall.

Did corporations give that money to their employees? No. According to CRS, the average American worker got an added bonus of \$28.

Did they invest in new jobs and output? No. The economy actually grew more slowly in the six quarters after the bill was passed than in the six quarters before it.

So where did the money go? I will tell you where most of it went. The tax cut helped corporations buy back over \$1 trillion of their own shares on Wall Street, which gave us a temporary sugar high on Wall Street. We may as well have burned that money on The National Mall.

For this—for this—the Republican tax bill took from middle-class families money they needed to buy their first home, to send their kids to college, to stay in their home when they retire.

For this, because capping SALT wasn't nearly enough to pay for that bill, the bill blew a \$2 trillion hole in the national debt—just as everyone on our side predicted because we used something called math.

Madam Speaker, let's restore the SALT deduction. Vote for this bill.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PORTER).

Ms. PORTER. Madam Speaker, when Congress enacted the first income tax in 1861, in the midst of the Civil War, it included the first exemption for State and local taxes.

President Trump's tax law violated our Nation's long-held views of States' rights and a limited Federal Government.

It has long been accepted in America that we do not tax the same income twice. Federal taxation must not crowd out the taxes needed to support critical State and local functions like good schools, roads, and bridges. That principle was first stated in the Federalist Papers. It is a core component of States' rights, and it was attacked by Trump's tax law.

The SALT deduction expresses the longstanding American preference of local solutions to local problems.

President Trump's tax law hurts California communities. By limiting the deductibility of State and local taxes, the Trump tax law was a direct threat to States and communities that are investing in local services. Over the long-term, it will cause local governments to slash revenue that funds schools, healthcare, transit, parks, and first responders.

This bill will not only help middle-class families, but it will expand tax relief for educators by doubling the tax credit from \$250 to \$500. It will create a new tax credit for first responders, the people who put their lives on the line every day to serve us.

I am heartened that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to work on a progressive income tax. I am heartened that they want to tax billionaires and ultramillionaires and champion a progressive tax system that addresses income inequality.

But this vote today is about principle. It is about standing up for the principle that States and localities are able to fund the services that are most crucial to their communities.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, in the spirit of the holiday season, I accept the motion to recommit.

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit H.R. 5377 will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Passage of H.R. 5377, if ordered; and
Passage of H.R. 5430.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 36, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 699]

YEAS—388

Abraham	DelBene	Keating
Adams	Delgado	Keller
Aderholt	Demings	Kelly (IL)
Allen	DeSaulnier	Kelly (MS)
Amash	DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)
Amodei	Deutsch	Kennedy
Armstrong	Diaz-Balart	Khanna
Arrington	Dingell	Kildee
Axne	Doggett	Kilmer
Babin	Doyle, Michael	Kim
Bacon	F.	Kind
Baird	Duncan	King (IA)
Balderson	Dunn	King (NY)
Banks	Emmer	Kinziger
Barr	Engel	Kirkpatrick
Beatty	Escobar	Krishnamoorthi
Bera	Eshoo	Kuster (NH)
Bergman	Estes	Kustoff (TN)
Beyer	Evans	LaHood
Bilirakis	Ferguson	LaMalfa
Bishop (GA)	Finkenauer	Lamb
Bishop (NC)	Fitzpatrick	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Langevin
Blumenauer	Flores	Larsen (WA)
Blunt Rochester	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Bonamici	Foster	Latta
Bost	Foxx (NC)	Lawrence
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel	Lawson (FL)
F.	Fulcher	Lee (NV)
Brady	Gabbard	Lesko
Brindisi	Gaetz	Levin (CA)
Brooks (AL)	Gallagher	Lewis
Brooks (IN)	Gallego	Lipinski
Brown (MD)	Garamendi	Loeb
Brownley (CA)	Garcia (IL)	Lofgren
Buchanan	Gianforte	Long
Buck	Gibbs	Loudermilk
Bucshon	Gohmert	Lowenthal
Budd	Golden	Lowe
Burchett	Gomez	Lucas
Burgess	Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer
Bustos	Gonzalez (TX)	Lujan
Butterfield	Gooden	Luria
Byrne	Gottheimer	Lynch
Calvert	Granger	Malinowski
Carbajal	Graves (GA)	Maloney
Cárdenas	Graves (LA)	Carolyn B.
Carson (IN)	Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean
Carter (GA)	Green (TN)	Marchant
Carter (TX)	Green, Al (TX)	Marshall
Cartwright	Griffith	Massie
Case	Grijalva	Mast
Castor (FL)	Grothman	Matsui
Chabot	Guest	McAdams
Cheney	Guthrie	McBath
Chu, Judy	Haaland	McCarthy
Cicilline	Hagedorn	McCauley
Cisneros	Harder (CA)	McClintock
Clark (MA)	Harris	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Hartzler	McGovern
Cline	Hastings	McHenry
Cloud	Heck	McKinley
Cohen	Hern, Kevin	McNerney
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Collins (GA)	Hice (GA)	Meng
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Meuser
Conaway	Higgins (NY)	Miller
Connolly	Hill (AR)	Mitchell
Cook	Himes	Moolenaar
Cooper	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Costa	Hollingsworth	Morelle
Courtney	Horn, Kendra S.	Moulton
Cox (CA)	Horsford	Mucarsel-Powell
Craig	Houlahan	Mullin
Crawford	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)
Crenshaw	Hudson	Murphy (NC)
Crist	Huffman	Neal
Crow	Huizenga	Newhouse
Cuellar	Hurd (TX)	Norcross
Cunningham	Jackson Lee	Norman
Curtis	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Davids (KS)	Johnson (LA)	O'Halleran
Davidson (OH)	Johnson (OH)	Ocasio-Cortez
Davis (CA)	Johnson (SD)	Olson
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (TX)	Palazzo
Davis, Rodney	Jordan	Pallone
Dean	Joyce (OH)	Palmer
DeFazio	Joyce (PA)	Panetta
DeGette	Kaptur	Pappas
DeLauro	Katko	Pascrell

Pence	Schiff
Perlmutter	Schneider
Perry	Schrader
Peters	Schrier
Peterson	Schweikert
Phillips	Scott (VA)
Pingree	Scott, Austin
Porter	Scott, David
Possey	Sensenbrenner
Pressley	Sewell (AL)
Price (NC)	Shalala
Rice (NY)	Sherman
Rice (SC)	Sherrill
Riggleman	Simpson
Roby	Sires
Rodgers (WA)	Slotkin
Roe, David P.	Smith (MO)
Rogers (AL)	Smith (NE)
Rogers (KY)	Smith (NJ)
Rooney (FL)	Smith (WA)
Rose (NY)	Smucker
Rose, John W.	Soto
Rouda	Spanberger
Rouzer	Spano
Roy	Speier
Roybal-Allard	Stanton
Ruiz	Staubert
Ruppersberger	Stefanik
Rush	Steil
Rutherford	Steube
Ryan	Stewart
Sánchez	Suozzi
Sarbanes	Takano
Scalise	Taylor
Scanlon	Thompson (CA)
Schakowsky	Thompson (PA)
	Thornberry
	Timmons
	Tipton
	Titus

NAYS—36

Aguilar	Fletcher	Neguse
Allred	Fudge	Omar
Barragán	Garcia (TX)	Payne
Bass	Gosar	Pocan
Biggs	Jayapal	Richmond
Casten (IL)	Jeffries	Stevens
Castro (TX)	Lee (CA)	Swalwell (CA)
Clay	Levin (MI)	Thompson (MS)
Cleaver	Lieu, Ted	Underwood
Clyburn	McEachin	Visclosky
Correa	Moore	Waters
Español	Napolitano	Watson Coleman

NOT VOTING—6

Hayes	Meadows	Serrano
Hunter	Nadler	Shimkus

□ 1559

Messrs. BIGGS, ALLRED, Mrs. FLETCHER, Messrs. PAYNE and NEGUSE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BURCHETT, STANTON, SIRE, COHEN, CUELLAR, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. SPEIER, MATSUI, MENG, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Messrs. GARCÍA of Illinois, LUJÁN, HUFFMAN, Ms. SCANLON, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Messrs. KEATING, MCNERNEY, Ms. BONAMICI, PRESSLEY, and Mr. DESAULNIER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the instructions of the House in the motion to recommit, I report the bill, H.R. 5377, back to the House with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. SHERILL). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of California:

In the matter proposed to be inserted by section 2(a), insert “if the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for such taxable year does not exceed \$100,000,000,” after “January 1, 2020.”

In section 3, strike subsection (a) and insert the following:

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 164(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) SUSPENSION OF DOLLAR LIMITATION ON STATE AND LOCAL TAXES FOR 2020 AND 2021.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in 2020 or 2021, subparagraph (B) of paragraph (6) shall not apply.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN HIGH-INCOME TAXPAYERS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if the adjusted gross income of such taxpayer for such taxable year exceeds \$100,000,000.”

In the matter proposed to be inserted by each of sections 4(a), 4(b)(2), 5(a), and 5(c), strike “\$500” and insert “\$1,000”.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 218, noes 206, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 700]

AYES—218

Adams	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Aguilar	Cicilline	DeGette
Barragán	Cisneros	DeLauro
Bass	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Delgado
Bera	Clay	Demings
Beyer	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Deutsch
Blumenauer	Cohen	Dingell
Blunt Rochester	Connolly	Doyle, Michael
Bonamici	Cooper	F.
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Engel
F.	Costa	Escobar
Brindisi	Courtney	Eshoo
Brown (MD)	Cox (CA)	Español
Brownley (CA)	Craig	Evans
Bustos	Crist	Fitzpatrick
Carbajal	Crow	Fletcher
Cárdenas	Cuellar	Foster
Carson (IN)	Cunningham	Frankel
Cartwright	Davids (KS)	Fudge
Case	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Casten (IL)	Davis, Danny K.	Gallego
Castor (FL)	Dean	Garamendi

Garcia (IL)	Lowey	Sarbanes	Nunes	Rutherford	Turner	Barr	Fleischmann	Lewis
Garcia (TX)	Luján	Scanlon	Ocasio-Cortez	Scalise	Upton	Bass	Fletcher	Lipinski
Gomez	Luria	Schakowsky	Olson	Schweikert	Wagner	Beatty	Flores	Loeb sack
Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch	Schiff	Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Walberg	Bera	Fortenberry	Lofgren
Gottheimer	Malinowski	Schneider	Palmer	Sensenbrenner	Walden	Bergman	Foster	Long
Green, Al (TX)	Maloney,	Schrader	Pappas	Simpson	Walker	Beyer	Foxx (NC)	Loudermilk
Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Schrier	Pence	Smith (MO)	Walorski	Biggs	Frankel	Lowe y
Haaland	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)	Perry	Smith (NE)	Waltz	Bilirakis	Fulcher	Lucas
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Scott, David	Pocan	Smucker	Watkins	Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Luetkemeyer
Hastings	McBath	Sowell (AL)	Posey	Spanberger	Weber (TX)	Bishop (NC)	Gaetz	Luján
Hayes	McCollum	Shalala	Ratcliffe	Spano	Webster (FL)	Bishop (UT)	Gallagher	Luria
Heck	McEachin	Sherman	Reschenthaler	Stanton	Wenstrup	Blumenauer	Galle go	Lynch
Higgins (NY)	McGovern	Sherrill	Rice (SC)	Stauber	Westerman	Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	Malinowski
Himes	McNerney	Sires	Riggleman	Stefanik	Williams	Bonamici	Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Horsford	Meeks	Slotkin	Roby	Steil	Wilson (SC)	Bost	Gianforte	Marchant
Houlahan	Meng	Smith (NJ)	Rodgers (WA)	Steube	Wittman	Boyle, Brendan	Gibbs	Marshall
Hoyer	Moore	Smith (WA)	Roe, David P.	Stewart	Womack	F.	Gohmert	Mast
Huffman	Morelle	Soto	Rogers (AL)	Stivers	Woodall	Brady	Gomez	Matsui
Jackson Lee	Moulton	Speier	Rogers (KY)	Taylor	Wright	Brindisi	Gonzalez (OH)	McAdams
Jayapal	Mucarsel-Powell	Stevens	Rooney (FL)	Thompson (PA)	Yoho	Brooks (AL)	Gonzalez (TX)	McBath
Jeffries	Napolitano	Suo zzi	Rose, John W.	Thornberry	Young	Brooks (IN)	Gooden	McCarthy
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Swalwell (CA)	Rouzer	Timmons	Zeldin	Brownley (CA)	Gosar	McCaul
Johnson (TX)	Neguse	Takano	Roy	Tipton		Buchanan	Gottheimer	McClintock
Kaptur	Norcross	Thompson (CA)				Buck	Granger	McCollum
Katko	O'Halleran	Thompson (MS)				Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Keating	Omar	Titus	Butterfield	Meadows	Serrano	Budd	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Kelly (IL)	Pallone	Tlaib	Hunter	Nadler	Shimkus	Burchett	Graves (MO)	McNerney
Kennedy	Panetta	Tonko				Burgess	Green (TN)	Meeks
Khanna	Pascrell	Torres (CA)				Bustos	Green, Al (TX)	Meuser
Kildee	Payne	Torres Small				Butterfield	Griffith	Miller
Kilmer	Perlmutter	(NM)				Byrne	Grijalva	Mitchell
Kim	Peters	Trahan				Calvert	Grothman	Moolenaar
Kind	Peterson	Trone				Carbajal	Guest	Mooney (WV)
King (NY)	Phillips	Underwood				Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Moore
Kirkpatrick	Pingree	Van Drew				Carter (GA)	Haaland	Morelle
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Vargas				Carter (TX)	Hagedorn	Moulton
Lamb	Pressley	Veasey				Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Mucarsel-Powell
Langevin	Price (NC)	Vela				Case	Harris	Mullin
Larsen (WA)	Quigley	Velázquez				Casten (IL)	Hartzler	Murphy (FL)
Larson (CT)	Raskin	Visclosky				Castor (FL)	Hastings	Murphy (NC)
Lawrence	Reed	Wasserman				Castro (TX)	Hayes	Napolitano
Lawson (FL)	Rice (NY)	Schultz				Chabot	Heck	Neal
Lee (CA)	Richmond	Watson				Cheney	Hern, Kevin	Neguse
Levin (CA)	Rose (NY)	Watson Coleman				Chu, Judy	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Levin (MI)	Rouda	Welch				Ciilline	Hice (GA)	Norman
Lewis	Roybal-Allard	Wexton				Cisneros	Higgins (LA)	Nunes
Lieu, Ted	Ruiz	Wild				Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Lipinski	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)				Cleaver	Hill (AR)	Olson
Loeb sack	Rush	Yarmuth				Cline	Himes	Palazzo
Lofgren	Ryan					Cloud	Holding	Palmer
Lowenthal	Sánchez					Clyburn	Hollingsworth	Panetta

NOES—206

Abraham	Curtis	Hudson
Aderholt	Davidson (OH)	Huizenga
Allen	Davis, Rodney	Hurd (TX)
Allred	DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)
Amash	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (OH)
Amodei	Doggett	Johnson (SD)
Armstrong	Duncan	Jordan
Arrington	Dunn	Joyce (OH)
Axne	Emmer	Joyce (PA)
Babin	Estes	Keller
Bacon	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)
Baird	Finkenauer	Kelly (PA)
Balderson	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Banks	Flores	Kinzing er
Barr	Fortenberry	Kuster (NH)
Bergman	Foxx (NC)	Kustoff (TN)
Biggs	Fulcher	LaHood
Bilirakis	Gaetz	LaMalfa
Bishop (NC)	Gallagher	Lamborn
Bishop (UT)	Gianforte	Latta
Bost	Gibbs	Lee (NV)
Brady	Gohmert	Lesko
Brooks (AL)	Golden	Long
Brooks (IN)	Gonzalez (OH)	Loudermilk
Buchanan	Gooden	Lucas
Buck	Gosar	Luetkemeyer
Bucshon	Granger	Marchant
Budd	Graves (GA)	Marshall
Burchett	Graves (LA)	Massie
Burgess	Graves (MO)	Mast
Byrne	Green (TN)	McAdams
Calvert	Griffith	McCarthy
Carter (GA)	Grothman	McCaul
Carter (TX)	Guest	McClintock
Castro (TX)	Guthrie	McHenry
Chabot	Hagedorn	McKinley
Cheney	Harris	Meuser
Cline	Hartzler	Miller
Cloud	Hern, Kevin	Mitchell
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Moolenaar
Collins (GA)	Hice (GA)	Mooney (WV)
Comer	Higgins (LA)	Mullin
Conaway	Hill (AR)	Murphy (FL)
Cook	Holding	Murphy (NC)
Crawford	Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Crenshaw	Horn, Kendra S.	Norman

NOT VOTING—6

Butterfield	Meadows	Serrano
Hunter	Nadler	Shimkus

□ 1609

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, following the vote on the passage of H.R. 5430, Members are advised that there will be no more votes in the House until January 7.

Madam Speaker, I want to wish all Members of this House, their staffs, and all the employees of this institution, on whom we rely so much and who do so much for us and for our country, a happy holiday season with their family and loved ones and with their neighbors.

May God bless our country.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 5430) to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 41, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 701]

YEAS—385

Abraham	Allred	Babin
Adams	Amodei	Bacon
Aderholt	Armstrong	Baird
Aguilar	Arrington	Balderson
Allen	Axne	Banks

Barr	Fleischmann	Lewis
Bass	Fletcher	Lipinski
Beatty	Flores	Loeb sack
Bera	Fortenberry	Lofgren
Bergman	Foster	Long
Beyer	Foxx (NC)	Loudermilk
Biggs	Frankel	Lowe y
Bilirakis	Fulcher	Lucas
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (NC)	Gaetz	Luján
Bishop (UT)	Gallagher	Luria
Blumenauer	Galle go	Lynch
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	Malinowski
Bonamici	Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean
Bost	Gianforte	Marchant
Boyle, Brendan	Gibbs	Marshall
F.	Gohmert	Mast
Brady	Gomez	Matsui
Brindisi	Gonzalez (OH)	McAdams
Brooks (AL)	Gonzalez (TX)	McBath
Brooks (IN)	Gooden	McCarthy
Brownley (CA)	Gosar	McCaul
Buchanan	Gottheimer	McClintock
Buck	Granger	McCollum
Bucshon	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Budd	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Burchett	Graves (MO)	McNerney
Burgess	Green (TN)	Meeks
Bustos	Green, Al (TX)	Meuser
Butterfield	Griffith	Miller
Byrne	Grijalva	Mitchell
Calvert	Grothman	Moolenaar
Carbajal	Guest	Mooney (WV)
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	Moore
Carter (GA)	Haaland	Morelle
Carter (TX)	Hagedorn	Moulton
Cartwright	Harder (CA)	Mucarsel-Powell
Case	Harris	Mullin
Casten (IL)	Hartzler	Murphy (FL)
Castor (FL)	Hastings	Murphy (NC)
Castro (TX)	Hayes	Napolitano
Chabot	Heck	Neal
Cheney	Hern, Kevin	Neguse
Chu, Judy	Herrera Beutler	Newhouse
Ciilline	Hice (GA)	Norman
Cisneros	Higgins (LA)	Nunes
Clark (MA)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Cleaver	Hill (AR)	Olson
Cline	Himes	Palazzo
Cloud	Holding	Palmer
Clyburn	Hollingsworth	Panetta
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Pappas
Cole	Horsford	Payne
Collins (GA)	Houlahan	Pelosi
Comer	Hoyer	Pence
Conaway	Hudson	Perlmutter
Connolly	Huizenga	Perry
Cook	Hurd (TX)	Peters
Cooper	Jackson Lee	Peterson
Correa	Jeffries	Phillips
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Porter
Courtney	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Cox (CA)	Johnson (OH)	Price (NC)
Craig	Johnson (SD)	Quigley
Crawford	Johnson (TX)	Ratcliffe
Crenshaw	Jordan	Reed
Crist	Joyce (OH)	Reschenthaler
Crow	Joyce (PA)	Rice (NY)
Cuellar	Katko	Rice (SC)
Cunningham	Keating	Richmond
Curtis	Keller	Riggleman
Davids (KS)	Kelly (IL)	Roby
Davidson (OH)	Kelly (MS)	Rodgers (WA)
Davis (CA)	Kelly (PA)	Roe, David P.
Davis, Danny K.	Khanna	Rogers (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Kildee	Rogers (KY)
Dean	Kilmer	Rooney (FL)
DeGette	Kim	Rose (NY)
DeLauro	Kind	Rose, John W.
DelBene	King (IA)	Rouda
Delgado	King (NY)	Rouzer
Demings	Kinzing er	Roy
DesJarlais	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
Diaz-Balart	Kuster (NH)	Ruppersberger
Dingell	Kustoff (TN)	Rush
Doggett	LaHood	Rutherford
Doyle, Michael	LaMalfa	Ryan
F.	Lamb	Sánchez
Duncan	Lamborn	Sarbanes
Dunn	Langevin	Scalise
Emmer	Larsen (WA)	Scanlon
Escobar	Larson (CT)	Schakowsky
Eshoo	Latta	Schiff
Estes	Lawrence	Schneider
Evans	Lawson (FL)	Schrader
Ferguson	Lee (NV)	Schrier
Finkenauer	Lesko	Schweikert
Fitzpatrick	Levin (CA)	Scott (VA)

Scott, Austin	Stivers	Walden
Scott, David	Suozzi	Walker
Sensenbrenner	Swalwell (CA)	Walorski
Sewell (AL)	Takano	Waltz
Shalala	Taylor	Wasserman
Sherman	Thompson (CA)	Schultz
Sherrill	Thompson (MS)	Waters
Simpson	Thompson (PA)	Watkins
Sires	Thornberry	Weber (TX)
Slotkin	Timmons	Webster (FL)
Smith (MO)	Tipton	Welch
Smith (NE)	Titus	Wenstrup
Smith (NJ)	Torres (CA)	Westerman
Smith (WA)	Torres Small	Wexton
Smucker	(NM)	Wild
Soto	Trahan	Williams
Spanberger	Trone	Wilson (FL)
Spano	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Speier	Underwood	Wittman
Stanton	Upton	Womack
Stauber	Van Drew	Woodall
Stefanik	Vargas	Wright
Steil	Veasey	Yarmuth
Steube	Vela	Young
Stevens	Wagner	Zeldin
Stewart	Walberg	

NAYS—41

Amash	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez
Barragan	Kaptur	Omar
Brown (MD)	Kennedy	Pallone
Cardenas	Lee (CA)	Pascarell
Clarke (NY)	Levin (MI)	Pingree
Clay	Lieu, Ted	Pocan
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Pressley
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Raskin
Engel	Carolyn B.	Tlaib
Espallat	Massie	Tonko
Fudge	McEachin	Velázquez
Garcia (IL)	McGovern	Visclosky
Golden	Meng	Watson Coleman
Huffman	Norcross	Yoho

NOT VOTING—5

Hunter	Nadler	Shimkus
Meadows	Serrano	

□ 1621

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Madam Speaker, with respect to the vote on H.R. 5377, I was unavoidably delayed. I was in the Speaker's lobby at the time of the vote, and when I entered the Chamber, the vote had concluded.

Had I been on the floor, Madam Speaker, I would have voted “aye.”

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1865) “An Act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.”

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1822. An Act to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect

to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 151) “An Act to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.”

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 19, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, effective today.

Sincerely,

JIM JORDAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to clause 11 of rule X, clause 11 of rule I, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:

Mr. CRAWFORD, Arkansas, to rank after Mr. STEWART of Utah.

PROTECTING HAWAII'S UNIQUE AND FRAGILE ENVIRONMENT

(Mr. CASE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce my bill to protect one of the most unique and fragile environments on Earth, my Hawaii, from devastating invasive species.

Isolated Hawaii has one of the highest number and rate of endemic species anywhere. Invasive species have wreaked havoc on our natural environment as well as Hawaii agriculture.

In the last 200 years alone, countless plant and animal species have gone extinct, in large part because of invasives.

Leading countries have required strict invasive prevention measures. Even the continental United States requires inspections of goods from Hawaii to prevent the introduction of species that may damage mainland crops.

Yet, Hawaii's prevention regime is weak. My bill simply says that if these

invasive species prevention requirements are good enough for the rest of the country and much of the world, then they are good enough for Hawaii.

INDICTING CONGRESS FOR ABUSE OF POWER

(Mr. MASSIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MASSIE. Madam Speaker, just a few hours ago, this body voted for impeachment, so I rise today to speak about an abuse of power.

Congress has the sole power to declare war and the awesome responsibility to decide when, where, and for what purposes our soldiers will be asked to give their lives. Eighteen years ago, this body misappropriated that power by issuing an open-ended authorization to commit our soldiers to fight anywhere on the globe.

The so-called war on terror has claimed the lives of more American soldiers than lives of civilians who were lost on 9/11, not to mention over 100,000 lives of foreigners not associated with terror.

In the last week, this Chamber has passed over 6,000 pages of legislation, and it spent over a trillion dollars. Tragically, we just funded the 19th year of the war in Afghanistan, without changing or even defining a strategy for winning or ending that war.

So I close by indicting this very body for an abuse of power: abuse of our war powers and abuse of our power of the purse.

USMCA FAILS TO ADDRESS CLIMATE CRISIS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement.

While I am grateful that congressional Democrats worked very hard to improve the initial agreement, it still falls short in some critical areas. Let me address one.

There is an undeniable and unbreakable link between trade and climate pollution. Unfortunately, this agreement does not adequately address the ongoing and immediate climate crisis that we face.

For 25 years, we have watched as NAFTA painfully outsourced American jobs. Under this agreement, we will see the continued outsourcing of pollution, undermining our domestic and international efforts to address climate change.

The United States must get serious about this challenge and build international cooperation and commitments through all vehicles available to us, including our trade agreements.

Trade negotiations do not happen frequently, but their impact is felt for generations. I cannot support a deal

which fails to even acknowledge the global climate crisis that future generations will be left to bear.

□ 1630

CELEBRATING THE LIFE AND MILITARY LEGACY OF MORTON "SHEA" LANDY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life and the incredible military legacy of Morton "Shea" Landy.

Morton passed away on November 25 at the age of 90 in Curwensville, Pennsylvania.

Morton was a longtime resident of Clearfield County, Pennsylvania, although his military service took him across the world throughout his career.

After enlisting in the Marine Corps in 1946, Morton would go on to serve in Japan shortly after World War II, in the Caribbean during the Cuban Missile Crisis, and in Vietnam during the height of the Vietnam war, to name a few.

After 32 years of faithfully serving our Nation both domestically and abroad, Morton retired from the Marine Corps. He would finish his military career with not only the highest enlisted rank possible, but as the second highest sergeant major in the Marines.

Even still, Morton's service did not stop there. In retirement, he spent much of his time volunteering on behalf of the Clearfield County Historical Society, his local VFW, and the Marine Corps League.

The passing of Morton Landy is a profound loss, and I offer my sincerest condolences to Morton's family and to those who were forever touched by his commitment to service.

PRaising THE IMPEACHMENT VOTE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to praise my House colleagues for their votes to impeach President Donald Trump last night. I know it was not easy for many of them, but when called to make the tough choice, they proved themselves true patriots: They chose to protect and defend our country and our Constitution from a President who has little regard for either.

Foreign influence in American affairs was the Founding Fathers' biggest fear. That is why Presidents must be natural-born citizens.

But now we have a President who profits from foreign officials staying at his hotels, who solicits foreign interference in our elections, and who attacks everything American, including our courts, FBI, veterans, Gold Star families, and even our citizens.

The Founding Fathers would have been extremely proud of what we did last night. That is why I am proud to be a Member of a Congress that fights for the public good and not personal profit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

APPRECIATING INDIA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, as we, today, close this year's legislative session, I am grateful to reflect on significant opportunities experienced in 2019.

My highlight was my continued association with India as former co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian Americans, continuing my family's 75-year appreciation of India.

In August, I visited Mumbai to pay respects at the locations of the Islamic extremist attacks of November 26, 2018, the Indian equivalent of the 9/11 mass murder.

The Independence Day address by Prime Minister Narendra Modi in New Delhi was inspiring on August 15.

In September, it was extraordinary to be present in Houston for the Howdy Modi welcome of Prime Minister Modi by President Donald Trump. With 52,000 persons attending, it was the largest welcome event in American history for a head of state.

At the same time, the Indian Parliament, with multiparty support, voided the constitutional autonomy of Kashmir, supporting the Prime Minister's efforts to boost economic development, fight corruption, and end gender, cast, and religious discrimination.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism with the leadership of President Donald Trump.

Americans are grateful, as the world's oldest democracy, to see India succeed as the world's largest democracy.

CONGRATULATING JONAS ON HIS GRADUATION FROM COLLEGE

(Ms. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, today I congratulate my son Jonas, who graduates tomorrow from North Dakota State University's College of Agriculture and Applied Science.

When Jonas was in high school, he took postsecondary education classes at Inver Hills Community College, allowing him to graduate with a degree in natural resources management from NDSU in 3½ years.

I have four sons, and Jonas has always been the peacekeeper. He got into

less—well, actually, no trouble that I know of in high school, and he is such a loyal friend that he went to college with his three best friends.

Of course, I didn't want Jonas to leave Minnesota for college, but he decided that Minnesota just wasn't cold enough for him, so he moved to Fargo. Now that he is done tomorrow, I couldn't be happier to welcome him back home to Minnesota.

Congratulations, Jonas.

IMPEACHMENT WAS A SHAM

(Mr. BYRNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for weeks, we were told that we couldn't wait, we had to go forward with impeachment before Christmas, that the Republic was at stake. And then this House passed a purely partisan impeachment yesterday, and the Speaker has decided to hold the Articles of Impeachment.

That underscores the word "sham." That puts an exclamation point after the word "sham." That shows what a ridiculous exercise we just went through.

We can't dictate to the Senate how they handle their trial. They get to pick that.

This shows that they got cold feet on the other side. They don't have a case. They can't win a fair trial in the Senate, and they know it, and they are afraid to send the articles over there where it will get the fair trial and not the kangaroo court we had here.

THERE IS STILL TIME TO DELIVER THE AMERICAN FAMILY'S HOLIDAY WISH LIST

(Ms. WEXTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WEXTON. Mr. Speaker, when the American people sent us to Congress, they sent us here with policies they wished us to act upon—a wish list, if you will. And now, in the holiday season, let's reflect on what we have delivered for the American people from that wish list.

Federal workers will receive a 3.1 percent pay increase and, for the first time ever, 12 weeks of paid parental leave—two important priorities that I have fought for since I was sworn into office.

Just last week, we passed sweeping legislation that would help lower the skyrocketing cost of prescription drugs.

We also voted for universal background checks, equal pay for equal work, a living wage for hardworking Americans, equal protections for LGBTQ Americans, action on climate change, protection for Dreamers and TPS recipients, reauthorizing the Violence Against Women Act, and hundreds of other bipartisan bills.

But, Mr. Speaker, the House can't fulfill its wish list all on our own. We need the Senate to vote on the bills that we passed in this Chamber. And just like the Grinch whose heart grew three sizes just in time to save Christmas, Senator MCCONNELL can still deliver on the American family's holiday wish list.

RECOGNIZING DR. PAM MOBLEY FOR HER HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS IN THE BAHAMAS

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Pam Mobley, a physician from Knoxville. Dr. Mobley has been in the Bahamas since September assisting with medical relief efforts in the aftermath of Hurricane Dorian.

Dr. Mobley was on Green Turtle Cay in the Abaco Islands when Hurricane Dorian began battering the Bahamas. The storm displaced the local personnel on Green Turtle Cay, but Dr. Mobley decided to wait it out. Once it was safe, she began providing medical assistance to those injured in the hurricane.

Even though Dr. Mobley could have returned to the United States months ago, she has remained in the Bahamas to care for the injured and help with relief efforts. Her selfless actions are truly remarkable.

I applaud Dr. Mobley for her humanitarian efforts in the Bahamas and thank her for being an excellent representative of the Knoxville community.

I know I speak for many in east Tennessee when I say Pam is making us all very, very proud, Mr. Speaker.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

(Ms. SHALALA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHALALA. Mr. Speaker, today millions of Americans are working to pay off their student debt. This is already an enormous burden for those who have graduated from reputable schools, but it is nearly impossible for those who attend schools that failed to live up to their responsibilities to their students.

Predatory for-profit institutions recruit students with false promises and leave them with worthless degrees and thousands of dollars of debt. These schools are prone to sudden closure, leaving students stranded, with no recourse to continue their education.

The College Affordability Act works to solve these pressing issues that plague far too many students. The bill would prevent sudden closure of colleges by requiring creditors to act on warning signs. Finally, it would close the GI Bill loophole that allows for-

profit colleges to take advantage of our brave veterans.

I urge my colleagues to support this crucial legislation and hold the schools accountable to their students.

RECOGNIZING TRI GLOBAL ENERGY ON THEIR 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. ARRINGTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, west Texas is the breadbasket and energy basin of the United States of America. Our producers feed, clothe, and fuel this great Nation—and not with just conventional fuels, Mr. Speaker.

Texas is, by far, the largest producer of wind energy in the Nation. This is not only good for rural economies, but it also diversifies our energy production, and helps support our Nation's energy independence for future generations.

Today, I would like to recognize one of our outstanding west Texas wind energy developers, Tri Global Energy, and its CEO and good friend, John B. Billingsley, as they celebrate their 10th anniversary this year.

I commend Tri Global for their excellence in renewable energy over the past decade, and I wish them the very best success in the decades to come.

TURKEY AND NATO

(Mr. HILL of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Turkey's leader has threatened to shut down Incirlik Air Base in retaliation for possible U.S. sanctions related to the Syrian border incursion and the House's acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide a century ago.

What a sad day for the Atlantic Alliance that has shouldered so many burdens and shared so much loss in blood and treasure.

Since the end of World War II, America has backed Turkey and her independence and freedom from Soviet domination, culminating with Turkey joining the Alliance in 1952.

I am an original cosponsor of Representative KINZINGER's United States-Turkey Relations Review Act. This bill would require us to carefully assess the options for relocating American personnel and assets from Incirlik Air Base.

Given Turkey's purchase of the Russian air defense system, the incursion in northeast Syria, and now threatening to close Incirlik, Turkey is not acting like a true and reliable partner. Turkish Prime Minister Erdogan's provocative behavior merits the U.S. and other NATO allies to consider our options in the region.

JUST MERCY

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, we have much to be thankful for in this great and grand Nation.

We are thankful for our Constitution that allows us to define what is right and wrong.

I am thankful for all of the Americans who will be with their families, all of those who are documented and undocumented individuals in this country who have come for relief and refuge.

I am thankful for the Members of Congress who uphold this Constitution.

And I am also thankful for the opportunity to salute Bryan Stevenson, who has just turned his book, "Just Mercy," into a movie.

I look forward to working to reform the juvenile justice system, to adding my bills banning the box, banning solitary confinement, and alternative sentencing for our children.

Our children should be receiving restorative justice; and like Bryan Stevenson, I believe there is a future if we invest in the future of our young people.

So I intend to introduce, when we come back from this time in our districts, an omnibus, large juvenile justice reform bill that takes into consideration our teachers, our law enforcement, our social workers, our young people, our faith community, and Bryan Stevenson's advanced and innovative concept that delivers just mercy.

Happy holidays. Merry Christmas. Happy Kwanza to everyone in the United States of America for this wonderful holiday season.

□ 1645

SHAMEFUL IMPEACHMENT

(Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in recent American history, the President of the United States was impeached with only Members of one party voting for it. This has been a shameful, partisan exercise in the U.S. House from start to finish.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI's actions yesterday contradicted her previous statements that impeachment should only happen if it has bipartisan support.

Since the moment President Trump was sworn into office, Democrats in Congress had made it their mission to remove him and overturn the results of the 2016 election. On January 20, 2017, The Washington Post wrote that the effort to impeach President Donald John Trump is underway—and indeed it was.

President Trump did nothing wrong, and these Articles of Impeachment were totally meritless. The American

people and folks across West Virginia have been able to witness this unjust and unfair process.

Despite a rigged investigation and process, Democrats could still not find any real evidence of an actual crime. I will continue to stand with President Donald Trump as he fights back against this baseless impeachment.

I look forward to a fair trial in the U.S. Senate.

THE BIRTH OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

(Mr. GUEST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUEST. Mr. Speaker, the story of the birth of Jesus Christ from the Gospel of Luke:

And it came to pass in those days that there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed. And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was Governor of Syria. And all went to be taxed, everyone into his own city.

And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David, to be taxed with Mary, his espoused wife, being great with child.

And so it was that, while they were there, the days were accomplished that she should be delivered. And she brought forth her firstborn Son, and wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger; because there was no room for them in the inn.

And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night. And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid.

And the angel said unto them: Fear not, for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Savior which is Christ the Lord.

THE WAR ON PUTTING CHRIST IN CHRISTMAS

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, that was such a beautiful 1-minute speech, it is hard to follow it. It was such a great thing to say.

This morning when I got up, I read a column by one of the talking heads around here saying that there was a fictional war on Christmas, and I thought I might address the issue with my 1-minute speech.

There may or may not be a war on Christmas around here, but there is certainly a war on putting Christ in Christmas, and I am going to comment on the background music that we hear throughout the Christmas season.

In Washington, D.C., we have WASH, a typical radio station around the country. From 4 o'clock in the morning until 1 o'clock this afternoon, the only song that they played that mentioned Christ was "God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen."

This is corporate America at its best. They have a list of their 50 favorite songs for Christmas, and "God Rest You Merry, Gentlemen" was 50. They managed to find 49 great songs that didn't mention Christ.

If you get around shopping, Kohl's department store, and whatnot, Mr. Speaker, you will again and again hear the music background leaving out "Hark! The Herald Angels Sing," "Joy to the World," "O Come, All Ye Faithful"—all the songs that people my age grew up with.

I would hope that America will step forward and be aware of this and demand more of corporate America.

I finally would like to thank Sheboygan North High School in my district for playing "Joy to the World" and "Away in a Manger" in the Christmas parade.

SPEECH SHUT DOWN FOR IMPEACHMENT

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am here giving a 1-minute speech on the last day of our legislative week because not only in Judiciary were we prevented from having minority witnesses come and having a minority witness day—the majority could have changed the rules if they wanted but they didn't bother, they just violated their own rules—we have special orders every day, and that is 2 hours for each party. But with impeachment going on, the Speaker chose to shut down that for the week and shut down the 5-minute speeches, so she pretty well shut down speeches that we normally are allowed to have.

Normally, I would hope to read a Christmas proclamation, but since I am only allowed 3 more seconds, I will just say: Merry Christmas and happy new year.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 153. An act to promote veteran involvement in STEM education, computer science, and scientific research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology; in addition, to the Committee on Veteran's Affairs for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution recognizing the importance and significance of

the 2020 Census and encouraging individuals, families, and households across the United States to participate in the 2020 Census to ensure a complete and accurate count; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 150. An act to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. An act to reauthorize the West valley demonstration project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2333. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4566. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of victims of the mass shooting in Virginia Beach, Virginia, on May 31, 2019.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 50.—An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 216.—An act to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

S. 256.—An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

S. 737.—An act to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood.

S. 1790.—An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on December 17, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 5363. To reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAYNE). Pursuant to section 7(b) of

House Resolution 758, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. on Monday, December 23, 2019.

Thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 23, 2019, at 11 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. TORRES of California: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 772. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-357). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEAL: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5430. A bill to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement (Rept. 116-358, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEUTCH: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Cathy McMorris Rodgers (Rept. 116-359). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5130. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to adjust the employment size standard requirements for determining whether a manufacturing concern is a small business concern, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-360). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 5146. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require contracting officers to take a small business concern's past performance as part of a joint venture into account when evaluating the small business concern, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committees on Education and Labor, Natural Resources, Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, the Budget, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Reform discharged from further consideration. H.R. 5430 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 5490. A bill to amend section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, to require that annual budget submissions of the President to Congress provide an estimate of the cost per taxpayer of the deficit and of the public debt; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. STIVERS, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mrs. LURIA):

H.R. 5491. A bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 5492. A bill to repeal the Military Selective Service Act, and thereby terminate the registration requirements of such Act and eliminate civilian local boards, civilian appeal boards, and similar local agencies of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5493. A bill to prohibit the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service from awarding grants to entities that fund or support gross violations of internationally recognized human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. COOK, Mr. BERA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 5494. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received from State-based catastrophe loss mitigation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD (for himself and Mr. MEADOWS):

H.R. 5495. A bill to direct Federal agencies to transfer excess Federal electronic equipment, including computers, computer components, printers, and fax machines, to educational recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. COURTNEY):

H.R. 5496. A bill to include Iceland in the list of foreign states whose nationals are eligible for admission into the United States as E1 and E2 nonimmigrants if United States nationals are treated similarly by the Government of Iceland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTERMAN (for himself, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. BURCHETT):

H.R. 5497. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited conditional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5498. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to allow transportation of merchandise in noncontiguous trade on foreign-flag vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5499. A bill to provide a definition of reasonable rate for noncontiguous domestic ocean trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5500. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to exempt certain noncontiguous trade from the coastwise laws; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 5501. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an Office of

Drug Manufacturing; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRINDISI (for himself, Mr. KATKO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. GOSAR):

H.R. 5502. A bill to remove Federal barriers regarding the offering of mobile sports wagers on Indian lands when the applicable State and Indian Tribe have reached an agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, Mr. BEYER, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 5503. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Director of the National Park Service to prioritize certain funds for high-commuter corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5504. A bill to amend the National Dam Safety Program Act with respect to the definition of eligible high hazard potential dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 5505. A bill to provide for the establishment of clean technology consortia to enhance the economic, environmental, and energy security of the United States by promoting domestic development, manufacture, and deployment of clean technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 5506. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 by requiring preclearance quarantine inspections for all movement to or from the State of Hawaii by either domestic or international travel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRIST (for himself, Mr. RUTHERFORD, and Mrs. DEMINGS):

H.R. 5507. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require an alien lawfully admitted to the United States under a non-immigrant visa to obtain the approval of the Attorney General before receiving a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5508. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish additional requirements for certain transportation projects with estimated costs of \$2,500,000,000 or more, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. BRINDISI):

H.R. 5509. A bill to deem certain cartel organizations pursuant to section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. SABLON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. HAALAND, and Mr. STANTON):

H.R. 5510. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to explicitly authorize distribution of grant funds to the voting accessibility protection and advocacy system of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the system serving the American Indian consortium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 5511. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to initiate a rulemaking to reform the interregional transmission planning process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 5512. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. NEAL, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 5513. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Safe Drinking Water Act to modify the payment periods of loans from State revolving funds under those Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. HAALAND):

H.R. 5514. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to establish a program to provide loans to implement cost-effective energy efficiency measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire (for herself, Mr. SCHRAMMER, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mr. PAPPAS):

H.R. 5515. A bill to regulate certain State impositions on interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 5516. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. BERA):

H.R. 5517. A bill to affirm the friendship of the governments of the United States of America and the Republic of India, and to establish a bilateral partnership for collaboration to advance development and shared values, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 5518. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to carry out a Clean Cities Coalition Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5519. A bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to improve measurement and assessment capabilities for understanding proposed atmospheric interventions in Earth's climate, including, as a priority, the effects of proposed interventions in the stratosphere and in cloud-aerosol processes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 5520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand refundability and increase simplification of the research credit for certain small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5521. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to permit commercial filmmaking and photography on the United States Capitol grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 5522. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the eligibility requirements for transfer of unused entitlement to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 5523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide investment and production tax credits for emerging energy technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5524. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct annual surveys of veterans on experiences with medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5525. A bill to amend title 38 and title 5, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and other officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive health care from the Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SABLON):

H.R. 5526. A bill to provide for a nonvoting delegate to the Senate to represent American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. VEASEY):

H.R. 5527. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide financial assistance for projects relating to the modernization of the electric grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself and Mr. SPANO):

H.R. 5528. A bill to establish a Congressional Advisory Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics to investigate the relationship between institutions of higher education and intercollegiate athletic programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5529. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to expand the exception to the windfall elimination provision based on years of coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5530. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a rebate program to promote the purchase and installation of publicly accessible electric vehicle supply equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. RASKIN):

H.R. 5531. A bill to provide protection for survivors of domestic violence or sexual assault under the Fair Housing Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 5532. A bill to authorize the Director of the National Science Foundation to estab-

lish prize competitions related to deep fake detection technology; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H. Res. 773. A resolution electing certain Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to, considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DIAZ-BALART (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MCCAUL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 774. A resolution calling for the immediate release of Cuban democracy activist José Daniel Ferrer and commending the efforts of José Daniel Ferrer to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms in Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. FORTENBERRY):

H. Res. 775. A resolution recognizing and honoring Smokey Bear's 75 years of service to the United States and commitment to preventing unwanted human-caused wildfires and promoting forest health; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN introduced a bill (H.R. 5533) for the relief of Yazmin Fabiola Juarez Coyoy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 5490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

H.R. 5491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

The Congress shall have the power to provide for the common defense.

By Mr. DEFazio:

H.R. 5492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress)

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.R. 5493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 5494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. BUTTERFIELD:

H.R. 5495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, Congress has the power to collect taxes and expend funds to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Congress may also make laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution their powers enumerated under Article I.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 5496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. WESTERMAN:

H.R. 5497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 5501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. BRINDISI:

H.R. 5502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 5503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 5504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 5505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

By Mr. CASE:

H.R. 5506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. CRIST:

H.R. 5507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 5508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 5509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 5510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. HAALAND:

H.R. 5511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article One, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HOLDING:

H.R. 5512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H.R. 5513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof”.

By Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire:

H.R. 5515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof”.

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 5516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 5517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 5518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 5519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. NEGUSE:

H.R. 5520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 5521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 5522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 5523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RICE of South Carolina:

H.R. 5525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SAN NICOLAS:

H.R. 5526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution, Congress's authority to make all rule and regulations respecting the Territories and possessions.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 5527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 5528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 5529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 5530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ:

H.R. 5531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. WEXTON:

H.R. 5532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mrs. Watson Coleman:

H.R. 5533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. GRIFFITH and Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.

H.R. 30: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 96: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 129: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 172: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 191: Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

H.R. 230: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 479: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 510: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 784: Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, and Mr. KINZINGER.

H.R. 808: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 874: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 891: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 921: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 946: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1002: Mr. KEATING and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1043: Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1049: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 1108: Mr. COLE, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1139: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 1175: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1228: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1296: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1360: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1367: Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1374: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1379: Mrs. FLETCHER.

H.R. 1380: Mr. CUELLAR.

H.R. 1407: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 1417: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1450: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1530: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.

H.R. 1554: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1570: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 1581: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1683: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 1705: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 1715: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1717: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1749: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1750: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 1786: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1873: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1985: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1987: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1997: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2014: Mr. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 2073: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.

H.R. 2117: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2214: Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 2250: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2283: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 2293: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2354: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2382: Mr. BURCHETT.

H.R. 2391: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 2411: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 2412: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 2420: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 2433: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2466: Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2468: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. RASKIN.

H.R. 2471: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2498: Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 2560: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 2585: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2616: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 2693: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 2694: Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 2704: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2739: Mr. ARRINGTON.

H.R. 2767: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 2771: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 2777: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 2791: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 2802: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 2818: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2834: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.

H.R. 2843: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2857: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 2863: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2868: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 2881: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 2896: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 2931: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 2952: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 2953: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 2976: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2977: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 3016: Mr. DELGADO and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 3077: Ms. TLAB, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3114: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 3138: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3208: Mr. LOESACK.

H.R. 3215: Mr. LOESACK.

H.R. 3219: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3235: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 3306: Ms. HOULAHAN.

H.R. 3374: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3451: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 3473: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3509: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 3524: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3582: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 3588: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 3632: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 3828: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 3849: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3934: Mr. ROY.

H.R. 4009: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LAMBORN, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 4056: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 4069: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4078: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4220: Mr. COHEN and Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 4254: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4263: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4280: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4283: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 4370: Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 4399: Mr. STEUBE, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. MITCHELL, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 4487: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 4540: Mr. WELCH, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SCANLON, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4552: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 4563: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4595: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 4674: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4679: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4681: Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 4687: Mrs. FLETCHER and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 4732: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4764: Mr. CRIST.

H.R. 4768: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 4801: Mr. JOYCE of Ohio and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 4881: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 4894: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 4906: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 4913: Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 4945: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 4951: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 4967: Mr. DELGADO and Mr. BRINDISI.

H.R. 4979: Mr. KIND, Mr. EMMER, Mr. HARDER of California, and Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 4996: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 5003: Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

H.R. 5028: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 5041: Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 5056: Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 5092: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 5097: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 5136: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 5139: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 5151: Ms. SANCHEZ and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 5170: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 5191: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5210: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 5231: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 5233: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 5239: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 5297: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5311: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 5317: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 5336: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 5337: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 5356: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 5372: Mr. HECK.

H.R. 5410: Mr. CLINE and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 5431: Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 5434: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 5439: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma.

H.R. 5445: Mr. NEWHOUSE and Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 5450: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 5467: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 5473: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 5480: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 5485: Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 5487: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H. J. Res. 2: Ms. HOULAHAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. WILD, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. SCHRIER, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H. J. Res. 48: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. MCADAMS, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. TIPTON, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, and Mr. WALKER.

H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H. Res. 189: Ms. BONAMICI and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Res. 374: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H. Res. 452: Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H. Res. 527: Mr. COOPER.

H. Res. 701: Ms. MOORE.

H. Res. 723: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 742: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 744: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H. Res. 745: Ms. MOORE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEXTON, Mr. COX of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. POCAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. WATERS.

H. Res. 752: Mr. VARGAS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Mr. WRIGHT.

H. Res. 769: Mr. OLSON, Mr. MOONEY of West
Virginia, and Mr. BOST.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2019

No. 206

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable THOM TILLIS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are our light and salvation, and we are not afraid. You protect us from danger so we do not tremble.

Mighty God, You are not intimidated by the challenges that confront our Nation and world.

Lord, inspire our lawmakers with the knowledge of Your holiness that will give them reverential awe. Remind them of the many prayers they have prayed that You have already answered.

Lord, You have been our help in ages past. You are our hope for the years to come. We magnify Your Holy Name. Don't stay far off. Show Yourself strong to this generation and fill us with Your peace.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, December 19, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable THOM TILLIS, a Senator from the State of North Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TILLIS thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MUSEUM COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to H.R. 1865, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House Message to accompany H.R. 1865, an act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1258 (to the

House amendment to the Senate amendment), to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 1259 (to Amendment No. 1258), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1260, to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 1261 (the instructions (Amendment No. 1260) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell Amendment No. 1262 (to Amendment No. 1261), of a perfecting nature.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last night the House Democrats finally did what they had decided to do a long time ago. They voted to impeach President Trump.

Over the last 12 weeks, House Democrats have conducted the most rushed, least thorough, and most unfair impeachment inquiry in modern history. Now their slapdash process has concluded in the first purely partisan Presidential impeachment since the wake of the Civil War.

The opposition to impeachment was bipartisan. Only one part of one faction wanted this outcome. The House's conduct risks deeply damaging the institutions of American government. This particular House of Representatives has let its partisan rage at this particular President create a toxic new precedent that will echo well into the future.

That is what I want to discuss right now—the historic degree to which House Democrats have failed to do their duty and what it will mean for the Senate to do ours. So let's start at the beginning. Let's start with the fact

• This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S7167

that Washington Democrats made up their minds to impeach President Trump since before he was even inaugurated.

Here is a reporter in April of 2016—April of 2016:

Donald Trump isn't even the Republican nominee yet . . . [but] "Impeachment" is already on the lips of pundits, newspaper editorials, constitutional scholars, and even a few Members of Congress.

April 2016.

On Inauguration Day 2017, the headline in the Washington Post: "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun." That was day one.

In April 2017, 3 months into the Presidency, a senior House Democrat said: "I am going to fight every day until he is impeached." That was 3 months into the administration.

In December 2017, 2 years ago, Congressman JERRY NADLER was openly campaigning to be the ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee, specifically—specifically—because he was an expert on impeachment. That was NADLER's campaign to be the top Democrat on Judiciary.

This week wasn't even the first time House Democrats have introduced articles of impeachment. It was actually the seventh time. They started less than 6 months after the President was sworn in. They tried to impeach President Trump for being impolite to the press, for being mean to professional athletes, for changing President Obama's policy on transgender people in the military. All of these things were high crimes and misdemeanors according to Democrats. Now, this wasn't just a few people.

Scores—scores—of Democrats voted to move forward with impeachment on three of those prior occasions. So let's be clear. The House's vote yesterday was not some neutral judgement that Democrats came to with great reluctance. It was the predetermined end of a partisan crusade that began before President Trump was even nominated, let alone sworn in.

For the very first time in modern history, we have seen a political faction in Congress promise from the moment—the moment—a Presidential election ended that they would find some way to overturn it.

A few months ago, Democrats' 3-year-long impeachment in search of articles found its way to the subject of Ukraine. House Democrats embarked on the most rushed, least thorough, and most unfair impeachment inquiry in modern history. Chairman SCHIFF's inquiry was poisoned by partisanship from the outset. Its procedures and parameters were unfair in unprecedented ways. Democrats tried to make Chairman SCHIFF into a de facto special prosecutor, notwithstanding the fact that he is a partisan Member of Congress who had already engaged in strange and biased behavior.

He scrapped precedent to cut the Republican minority out of the process. He denied President Trump the same

sorts of procedural rights that Houses of both parties had provided to past Presidents of both parties. President Trump's counsel could not participate in Chairman SCHIFF's hearings, present evidence, or cross-examine witnesses.

The House Judiciary Committee's crack at this was even more ahistorical. It was like the Speaker called up Chairman NADLER and ordered one impeachment, rush delivery, please.

The committee found no facts on its own and did nothing to verify the Schiff report. Their only witnesses were liberal law professors and congressional staffers.

So there is a reason the impeachment inquiry that led to President Nixon's resignation required about 14 months of hearings—14 months—in addition to a special prosecutor's investigation.

With President Clinton, the independent counsel's inquiry had been underway literally for years before the House Judiciary Committee actually dug in. There were mountains of evidence—mountains—mountains of testimony from firsthand fact witnesses, and serious legal battles to get what was necessary.

This time around? House Democrats skipped all of that and spent just 12 weeks—12 weeks. There was more than a year of hearings for Nixon, multiple years of investigation for Clinton, and they have impeached President Trump in 12 weeks—12 weeks.

So let's talk about what the House actually produced in those 12 weeks. House Democrats' rushed and rigged inquiry yielded two articles—two—of impeachment. They are fundamentally unlike any articles that any prior House of Representatives has ever passed.

The first article concerns the core events which House Democrats claim are impeachable—the timing of aid to Ukraine. But it does not even purport to allege any actual crime. Instead, they deployed a vague phrase "abuse of power"—"abuse of power"—to impugn the President's action in a general, indeterminate way.

Speaker PELOSI's House just gave into a temptation that every other House in history has managed to resist. Let me say that again. Speaker PELOSI's House just gave into a temptation that every other House in our history has managed to resist. They impeach a President whom they do not even allege has committed an actual crime known to our laws. They have impeached simply because they disagree with a Presidential act and question the motive behind it.

So let's look at history. Andrew Johnson's impeachment revolved around a clear violation of a criminal statute, albeit an unconstitutional statute. Nixon had obstruction of justice, a felony under our laws. Clinton had perjury, also a felony.

Now, the Constitution does not say the House can impeach only those Presidents who violate a law, but his-

tory matters. History matters and precedent matters.

There were important reasons why every previous House of Representatives in American history restrained itself—restrained itself—from crossing this Rubicon. The Framers of our Constitution very specifically discussed whether the House should be able to impeach Presidents just for "maladministration"—just for maladministration—in other words, because the House simply thought the President had bad judgment or he was doing a bad job. They talked about all of this when they wrote the Constitution.

The written records of our Founders' debates show they specifically rejected this. They realized it would create total dysfunction to set the bar for impeachment that low.

James Madison himself explained that allowing impeachment on that basis would mean the President serves at the pleasure of the Congress instead of the pleasure of the American people. It would make the President a creature of Congress, not the head of a separate and equal branch. There were powerful reasons why Congress after Congress for 230 years—230 years—required Presidential impeachment to revolve around clear, recognizable crimes, even though that was not a strict limitation—powerful reasons why, for 230 years, no House opened the Pandora's box of subjective, political impeachments. That 230-year tradition died last night.

House Democrats have tried to say they had to impeach President Trump on this historically thin and subjective basis because the White House challenged their requests for more witnesses.

That brings us to the second article of impeachment. The House titled this one "Obstruction of Congress." What it really does is impeach the President for asserting Presidential privilege. The concept of executive privilege is another two-century-old constitutional tradition. Presidents starting with George Washington have invoked it. Federal courts have repeatedly affirmed it is a legitimate constitutional power.

House Democrats requested extraordinary amounts of sensitive information from President Trump's White House, exactly the kinds of things over which Presidents of both parties have asserted privilege in the past.

Predictably, and appropriately, President Trump did not simply roll over. He defended the constitutional authority of his office. There is no surprise there. It is not a constitutional crisis for a House to want more information than a President wants to give up. That is not a constitutional crisis. It is a routine occurrence. The separation of powers is messy by design.

Here is what should have happened: Either the President and Congress negotiate a settlement or the third branch of government, the Judiciary, addresses the dispute between the other two.

The Nixon impeachment featured disagreements over Presidential privilege, so they went to the courts. The Clinton impeachment featured disagreements over Presidential privilege, so they went to the courts. This takes time. It is inconvenient. That is actually the point. Due process is not meant to maximize the convenience of the prosecutor. It is meant to protect the accused, but this time was different.

Remember, 14 months of hearings for Richard Nixon, years of investigation for Bill Clinton, but 12 weeks for Donald Trump. Democrats didn't have to rush this, but they chose to stick to their political timetable at the expense of pursuing more evidence through proper legal channels. Nobody made Chairman SCHIFF do this. He chose to.

The Tuesday before last, on live television, ADAM SCHIFF explained to the entire country that if House Democrats had let the justice system follow its normal course, they might not have gotten to impeach the President in time for the election. My goodness.

In Nixon, the courts were allowed to do their work. In Clinton, the courts were allowed to do their work. Only these House Democrats decided due process is too much work, and they would rather impeach with no proof.

They tried to cover for their own partisan impatience by pretending the routine occurrence of a President exerting constitutional privilege is itself—*itself*—a second impeachable offense.

The following is something ADAM SCHIFF literally said in early October. Here is what he said: "Any action . . . that forces us to litigate, or have to consider litigation, will be considered further evidence of obstruction of justice." That is ADAM SCHIFF.

Here is what the chairman effectively said and what one of his committee members restated just this week: If the President asserts his constitutional right, it is that much more evidence he is guilty.

If the President asserts his constitutional rights, it is that much more evidence he is guilty.

That kind of bullying is antithetical to American justice. Those are the House Democrats' two Articles of Impeachment. That is all their rushed and rigged inquiry could generate: an act that the House does not even allege is criminal and a nonsensical claim that exercising a legitimate Presidential power is somehow an impeachable offense.

This is, by far, the thinnest basis for any House-passed Presidential impeachment in American history—the thinnest and the weakest, and nothing else even comes close.

Candidly, I don't think I am the only person around here who realizes this. Even before the House voted yesterday, Democrats had already started to signal uneasiness—uneasiness—with its end product.

Before the articles even passed, the Senate Democratic leader went on tele-

vision to demand this body redo House Democrats' homework for them; that the Senate should supplement Chairman SCHIFF's sloppy work so it is more persuasive than Chairman SCHIFF himself bothered to make it. Of course, every such demand simply confirms that House Democrats have rushed forward with a case that is much too weak.

In June, Speaker PELOSI promised the House would "build an ironclad case." Never mind that she was basically promising impeachment months—months—before the Ukraine events, but that is a separate matter. She promised "an ironclad case."

In March, Speaker PELOSI said this: "Impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there's something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don't think we should go down that path, because it divides the country."

By the Speaker's own standards, she has failed the country. This case is not compelling, not overwhelming, and as a result not bipartisan. The failure was made clear to everyone earlier this week when Senator SCHUMER began searching for ways the Senate could step out of our proper role and try to fix the House Democrats' failures for them.

It was made even more clear last night when Speaker PELOSI suggested that House Democrats may be too afraid—too afraid—to even transmit their shoddy work product to the Senate.

It looks like the prosecutors are getting cold feet in front of the entire country and second-guessing whether they even want to go to trial. They said impeachment was so urgent that it could not even wait for due process but now they are content to sit on their hands. This is really comical.

Democrats' own actions concede that their allegations are unproven. The articles aren't just unproven; they are all constitutionally incoherent—incoherent. Frankly, if either of these articles is blessed by the Senate, we could easily see the impeachment of every future President of either party.

Let me say that again. If the Senate blesses this historically low bar, we will invite the impeachment of every future President. The House Democrats' allegations, as presented, are incompatible with our constitutional order. They are unlike anything that has ever been seen in 230 years of this Republic.

House Democrats want to create new rules for this President because they feel uniquely enraged—they feel uniquely enraged. Long after the partisan fever of this moment has broken, the institutional damage will remain.

I have described the threat to the Presidency, but this also imperils the Senate itself. The House has created an unfair, unfinished product that looks nothing—nothing—like any impeachment inquiry in American history. If the Speaker ever gets her House in

order, that mess will be dumped over here on the Senate's lap.

If the Senate blesses this slapdash impeachment—if we say that from now on this is enough—then we invite an endless parade of impeachable trials. Future Houses of either party will feel free to toss a "jump ball" every time they feel angry—free to swamp the Senate with trial after trial no matter how baseless the charges.

We would be giving future Houses of either party unbelievable new power to paralyze the Senate at their whim—more thin arguments, more incomplete evidence, more partisan impeachments.

In fact, this same House of Representatives has already indicated they themselves may not be finished impeaching. The House Judiciary Committee told a Federal court this very week that it will continue its impeachment investigation even after voting on these articles, and multiple Democratic Members have already called publicly for more.

If the Senate blesses this, if the Nation accepts this, Presidential impeachments may cease being once-in-a-generation events and become a constant part—a constant part—of the political background noise. This extraordinary tool of last resort may become just another part of the arms race of polarization.

Real statesmen would have recognized, no matter their view of this President, that trying to remove him on this thin and partisan basis could unsettle the foundations of our Republic.

Real statesmen would have recognized, no matter how much partisan animosity might be coursing through their veins, that cheapening the impeachment process was not the answer.

Historians will refer to this as the very irony of our era: that so many who professed such concern for our norms and traditions themselves proved willing to trample our constitutional order to get their way.

It is long past time for Washington to get a little perspective. President Trump is not the first President with a populist streak, not the first to make entrenched elites uncomfortable. He is certainly not the first President to speak bluntly, to mistrust the administrative state, or to rankle unelected bureaucrats. Heaven knows, he is not the first President to assert the constitutional privileges of his office rather than roll over when Congress demands unlimited sensitive information. None of these things—none of them—is unprecedented.

I will tell you what would be unprecedented. It will be an unprecedented constitutional crisis if the Senate literally hands the House of Representatives a new, partisan "vote of no confidence" that the Founders intentionally withheld, destroying the independence of the Presidency. It will be unprecedented if we agree that any future House that disliked any future President can rush through an unfair

inquiry, skip the legal system, and paralyze the Senate with a trial. The House can do that at will under this President. It will be an unprecedented if the Senate says secondhand and third-hand testimony from unelected civil servants is enough to overturn the people's vote. It will be an unprecedented constitutional crisis if the Senate agrees to set the bar this low—forever.

It is clear what this moment requires. It requires the Senate to fulfill our founding purpose. The Framers built the Senate to provide stability, to take the long view of our Republic, to safeguard institutions from the momentary hysteria that sometimes consumes our politics, and to keep partisan passions from literally boiling over. The Senate exists for moments like this.

That is why this body has the ultimate say in impeachments. The Framers knew the House would be too vulnerable to transient passions and violent factionalism. They needed a body that could consider legal questions about what has been proven and political questions about what the common good of our Nation requires. Hamilton said explicitly in *Federalist* 65 that impeachment involves not just legal questions but inherently political judgments about what outcome best serves the Nation. The House can't do both. The courts can't do both.

This is as grave an assignment as the Constitution gives to any branch of government, and the Framers knew only the Senate could handle it. Well, the moment the Framers feared has arrived. A political faction in the lower Chamber has succumbed to partisan rage. A political faction in the House of Representatives has succumbed to a partisan rage. They have fulfilled Hamilton's prophecy that impeachment will "connect itself with the pre-existing factions . . . enlist all their animosities . . . [and] there will always be the greatest danger that the decision will be regulated more by the comparative strength of parties, than by the real demonstrations of innocence or guilt."

Alexander Hamilton.

That is what happened in the House last night. The vote did not reflect what had been proven; it only reflects how they feel about the President.

The Senate must put this right. We must rise to the occasion. There is only one outcome that is suited to the paucity of evidence, the failed inquiry, the slapdash case. There is only one outcome suited to the fact that the accusations themselves are constitutionally incoherent. There is only one outcome that will preserve core precedents rather than smash them into bits in a fit of partisan rage because one party still cannot accept the American people's choice in 2016. It could not be clearer which outcome would serve the stabilizing, institution-preserving, fever-breaking role for which the U.S. Senate was created and which outcome would betray it.

The Senate's duty is clear. The Senate's duty is clear. When the time comes, we must fulfill it.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the second time en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 397) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 1759) to amend title III of the Social Security Act to extend reemployment services and eligibility assessments to all claimants for unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4018) to provide that the amount of time that an elderly offender must serve before being eligible for placement in home detention is to be reduced by the amount of good time credits earned by the prisoner, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, last night, the House of Representatives voted to impeach President Donald Trump. It is only the third time in our Nation's history that the President of the United States has been impeached.

The articles of impeachment charge that President Trump abused the powers of his office by soliciting the interference of a foreign power in our elections, not for the good of the country but to benefit himself personally. The articles also charge that the President obstructed Congress in the investigation of those matters. Together, these articles suggest the President committed a grave injury to our grand democracy.

The conduct they describe is very much what the Founders feared when they forged the impeachment powers of the Congress. The Founders, in their

wisdom, gave the House the power to accuse and the Senate the power to judge. We are now asked to fulfill our constitutional role as a court of impeachment.

Now that the House of Representatives has impeached President Trump, the Nation turns its eyes to the Senate. What will the Nation see? Will the Nation see what Alexander Hamilton saw—a body of government with "confidence enough . . . to preserve, unawed and uninfluenced, the necessary impartiality," or will the Nation see the Senate dragged into the depths of partisan fervor?

The Nation just witnessed how the Republican leader sees his role in this chapter of our history—demonstrating both an unfortunate descent into partisanship and demonstrating the fundamental weakness of the President's defense.

Leader MCCONNELL claimed that the impeachment of President Trump is illegitimate because the House voted along party lines. Forgive me, but House Democrats cannot be held responsible for the cravenness of the House Republican caucus and their blind fealty to the President.

Leader MCCONNELL claimed that the impeachment was motivated by partisan rage—this from the man who said proudly, "I am not impartial. I have no intention to be impartial at all" in the trial of President Trump. What hypocrisy.

Leader MCCONNELL accused the House Democrats of an obsession to get rid of President Trump—this from the man who proudly declared his "number one goal" was to make President Obama a one-term President.

Leader MCCONNELL claimed that Democrats impeached the President for asserting Executive privilege. President Trump never formally claimed Executive privilege; he claimed "absolute immunity," and the White House Counsel wrote a letter stating simply that the administration would not comply with any subpoenas.

Leader MCCONNELL claimed that the Democrats' "obsession" with impeachment has prevented the House from pursuing legislation to help the American people. Leader MCCONNELL knows very, very well that the House Democratic majority has passed literally hundreds of bills that gather dust here in the Senate, condemned to a legislative graveyard by none other than Leader MCCONNELL himself, who proudly called himself the Grim Reaper.

Members of the 116th Senate have been denied the opportunity to legislate by Leader MCCONNELL. We aren't even allowed to debate the issues that would impact the American people: healthcare, infrastructure, prescription drugs. We could have spent the year debating these issues. We weren't doing impeachment. Leader MCCONNELL has chosen not to focus on these issues and to put none of these bills on the floor. As he reminds us often, he alone decides what goes on the floor.

Leader MCCONNELL claimed that the House did not afford the President due process. The leader knows well that President Trump refused to participate in the process, despite invitation, and blocked witnesses and documents from Congress in unprecedented fashion.

Leader MCCONNELL claimed that the House ran the “most rushed, least thorough, and most unfair impeachment inquiry in modern history.” I know that is the Republican talking point, but here is the reality: Leader MCCONNELL is plotting the most rushed, least thorough, and most unfair impeachment trial in modern history. His plan to prevent House managers from calling witnesses to prove their case is a dramatic break from precedent.

We heard a lot about precedent from the leader. Never has there been a Presidential impeachment trial in which the majority prevented the House managers from fairly presenting their case, to have witnesses explain their knowledge of the alleged malfeasance. Will Leader MCCONNELL, breaking precedent, strong-arm his caucus into making this the first Senate impeachment trial of a President in history that heard no witnesses?

We ask: Is the President's case so weak that none of the President's men can defend him under oath? Is the President's case so weak that none of the President's men can defend him under oath? If the House case is so weak, why is Leader MCCONNELL so afraid of witnesses and documents? We believe the House case is strong, very strong, but if the Republican leader believes it is so weak, why is he so afraid of relevant witnesses and documents, which will not prolong things very long in our proposal—four hours for each witness?

It is true, as the leader has said, that the Framers built the Senate to provide stability and to keep partisan passions from boiling over. However, their vision of the Senate is a far cry from the partisan body Senator MCCONNELL has created.

I hope America was watching the Republican leader deliver his speech. I really do, because most glaring of all was the fact that Leader MCCONNELL's 30-minute partisan stem-winder contained hardly a single defense of the President of the United States on the merits. Almost none have defended President Trump because they can't.

In the wake of an enormous amount of evidence uncovered by House investigators—much of it in the form of testimony by top Trump officials whom the administration tried to silence—the Republican leader could not rebut the accusations against the President with facts. The Republican leader complained about the process. The Republican leader made very partisan and inflammatory accusations about Democrats, but he did not advance an argument in defense of the President's conduct on the merits. That, in and of itself, is a damning reflection on the state of the President's defense.

Our goal in the Senate, above all, should be to conduct a fair and speedy trial. I have proposed a very reasonable structure that would do just that: four witnesses, only those with direct knowledge of the charges made by the House; only those who could provide new, relevant and potentially illuminating testimony; strict time limits on each stage of the process to prevent the trial from dragging out too long. It is eminently reasonable; it is eminently fair. A group with no partisan bias would come up with this type of proposal.

I have yet to hear one good argument as to why less evidence is better than more evidence, particularly in such a serious moment as impeachment of the President of the United States. In Leader MCCONNELL's 30-minute screed, he did not make one argument as to why witnesses and documents should not be a part of the trial.

President Trump protests that he did not receive due process in the House impeachment inquiry. Due process is the ability to respond to charges made against you and present your side of the case. The President was invited to provide witnesses and provide documents at every stage of the process. He chose not to.

Still, Democrats are offering the President due process again here in the Senate. The witnesses we suggest are top Trump-appointed officials. They aren't Democrats. We don't know if their testimony would exculpate the President or incriminate him, but their testimony should be heard. If the President's counsel wants to call other witnesses with direct knowledge of why the aid to Ukraine was delayed, we say that they should be able to do so. President Trump claims he wants due process. I suspect he would rather hide or name-call because if he really wanted due process, he could get it easily. One phone call to Leader MCCONNELL telling him to let his aides testify, one phone call to his chief of staff telling him to release the documents to Congress—both of these actions would let the truth come out. I ask again: Can none of the President's men come defend him under oath?

To my Republican colleagues, our message is a simple one. Democrats want a fair trial that examines the relevant facts. We want a fair trial. The message from Leader MCCONNELL at the moment is that he has no intention of conducting a fair trial, no intention of acting impartially, no intention of getting the facts.

Despite our disagreements, I will meet with Leader MCCONNELL soon to discuss the rules, but each Senator will influence whether the Senate lives up to its constitutional duty to serve as an impartial court of impeachment. In the coming weeks, Republican senators will face a choice. Each Republican Senator will face a choice. Do they want a fair trial or do they want to allow the President free rein? Each Senator must ask himself or herself:

Do you want a fair trial or do you want the President to do whatever he wants, regardless of the rule of law, regardless of the consequences to this great Nation?

The Nation turns its eyes to the Senate. What will it see?

The President of the United States has spent the past several months telling Congress that it has no right to oversight and no right to investigate any of his activities; that he has absolute immunity; that article II of the Constitution gives him the “right to do whatever he wants.” Those are the President's words. Past Senates have disagreed with such views and strongly, proudly stood up for the notion that the President is not omnipotent. Democrats have done it; Republicans have done it—and often Presidents of their own party.

The Senate has said in the past that the President serves the people, not himself; that he is not a King. Will it do so again or will it shirk from that responsibility?

If the Republicans lead with the majority leader's scheme to sweep these charges under the rug and permit the President to ignore Congress, they will be creating a new precedent that will long be remembered as one of the Senate's darkest chapters. It will be remembered as a time when a simple majority in the Senate sought to grant two new rights to the President: the right to use the government for personal purposes and the right to ignore Congress at his pleasure. Here I agree with Senator MCCONNELL: “Moments like this are why the Senate exists.” If the President commits high crimes and misdemeanors and the Congress can do nothing about it, not even conduct a fair tribunal where his conduct is judged by dispassionate representatives of the people, then the President can commit those crimes with impunity. This President can; others can.

I have little doubt that if we tell the President that he can escape scrutiny in this instance, he will do it again and again and again. Future Presidents will take note and may do worse. The most powerful check on the Executive, the one designed to protect the people from tyranny, will be erased.

This chapter in our history books could be a lesson about the erosion of checks and balances in our modern age or it could be a proud reaffirmation of those founding principles. This chapter in our history books could be about the overpowering partisanship of our times or it could be about the Senate's capacity to overcome it. Again, moments like this are why the U.S. Senate exists.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Utah.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is December, so America's attention turns once again to the great debate of our times: What is the best Christmas movie? Is it “White Christmas,” maybe “Elf,” “A

Christmas Story,” “Home Alone,” or “Die Hard”? That is a good one. A lot of people are partial to “It’s a Wonderful Life” or “Braveheart.” Now, “Braveheart,” of course, has nothing to do with Christmas, but it is about freedom. Nothing says freedom quite like Christmas.

We have to debate, you see, the best Christmas movie out there for the simple reason that we also have to watch every year the worst Christmas movie. The worst Christmas movie is the one that runs every single year from this Chamber right here in this city on C-SPAN just a week before our Lord’s birthday. It is called omnibus. Critics and fans have loved to hate it for years. As is always the case in these money-grabbing sequels, the actors and the writers and the directors are just mailing it in. They know they can do this every year, and it works for them, so they mail it in. The only plot twist this time is that instead of a continuing resolution or a single omnibus, leaders and appropriators have cleverly put the negotiated spending agreement into two bills so that we can all pretend it is better than just one.

Even though they were negotiated at the same time, released to the public at the same time, and will be voted on within only minutes of each other, we have had different formulations of this over the years. Sometimes it is a continuing resolution. Sometimes it is an omnibus. Sometimes it is a couple of minibuses capped off with another continuing resolution. Sometimes we call it a CROmnibus. This time I think we can call it a double-decker minibus, but whatever you want to call it, it is the same movie. It is a rerun, and it is not very good. In fact, it is really, really bad. The secretive, undemocratic, irresponsible, and ultimately irresponsible process that produced this bill is nothing short of a sham, but then, again, so is the substance of the bill. It has been like this for years now. Instead of actively setting and passing budgets within which we intend to stay, as we expect from any other organization, we make it up as we go along in as abusive and dysfunctional a fashion as the American people will possibly let us get away with because that seems to be our aim—do whatever they let us get away with.

In fact, the last time Congress passed all of its respective appropriations bills in each of the dozen or so categories in which we spend money—and we pass each of those bills unbundled and on time—was back in 1997. For this fiscal year, we have already passed two continuing resolutions.

An omnibus bill in and of itself doesn’t have to be a bad thing. In fact, one could make it a relatively good thing. You see, in theory, an omnibus could be a decent legislative vehicle if—and only if, that is—Members of the House and the Senate were given time to read it, to debate it, and to offer, consider, and vote upon amendments to offer improvements to that legislation.

So I really don’t care whether it is a dozen individual spending bills or a small handful of minibuses or whether it is a single bill; what I want is consideration on the floor of the Senate in front of the American people so they can be aware of what is happening, so we can exercise the election certifies we fought so hard for. Each one of us is made more relevant when we get that opportunity and less relevant when we are denied.

Unfortunately, it is just never the case anymore that we have those kinds of opportunities to debate, discuss, and consider amendments, and to receive the underlying legislation in enough time for any of us to make a difference. These bills are written entirely behind closed doors by a small handful of leaders from two parties—thousands of pages of spending trillions of dollars and released to public scrutiny for the first time within only hours of what would otherwise become a government shutdown.

You see, this is a feature, not a bug. For those in charge of this process, this is a good thing because this is what allows them to write it on their own. The law firm, as I sometimes describe it—the law firm of MCCONNELL, SCHUMER, PELOSI, MCCARTHY, and a small handful of staffers and a few other Members around them write this bill, and then it is presented to us as a single, binary, take-it-or-leave-it package. You fund this and everything in it or you fund nothing. You vote for this package or you are blamed for a government shutdown. It is not right.

This, we somehow manage to call rather euphemistically, is bipartisanship. Like too much of what Washington calls bipartisanship these days, these spending bills are a fiscal dumpster fire. You see, they are masquerading under the banner of bipartisan compromise, when, in fact, they are collusion—collusion just by a small handful of Members of Congress who don’t have to have their provisions debated and discussed and subject to amendment.

On the merits, and not just on the procedure, this bill is a dumpster fire. Discretionary spending will be set at record-high levels in nearly every category of government spending.

This omnibus—or double-decker minibus, as I sometimes call it—will add \$2.1 trillion to the national debt over the next 20 years. By that time, we will be spending more on interest on the debt than we do on national defense.

This is embarrassing. It is embarrassing to the American people, and it ought to be especially embarrassing to those of us elected to represent our respective States in the U.S. Senate. What has historically called itself the world’s greatest deliberative body has become something substantially less glorious than that.

When we had a trillion-dollar deficit after the 2008 financial crisis, everyone admitted it. Everyone admitted it was

a problem; that it was reckless and out of control. President Obama admitted it. Now we are borrowing just as much, and we are doing so at the top of the business cycle. With wages up and unemployment at record lows, it is an awful, corrupt cycle on repeat. Congress breaks its own spending rules, creates new ones to spend more, and then breaks the new ones and tries to hide the evidence, racking up ever more national debt all the while.

What is worse, we are literally putting the brunt of the cost of all of this on future generations, on those who are not yet here and not able to vote for or against the politicians who are doing this to them. Gorging ourselves on debt to the tune of another trillion dollars a year means we are saddling our children and our children’s children with the cost of this bill, and we are setting ourselves up for a disaster come the next inevitable recession.

John F. Kennedy famously said “to govern is to choose,” but Congress’s defining dysfunction is that it doesn’t choose. It chooses not to choose rather deliberately. We don’t budget. We don’t reform. We don’t prioritize. We just spend, and we hope we are retired or—let’s face it—dead when the bill for our negligence and recklessness finally comes due.

Not only does this package feature reckless spending, but it includes many bills it should not, with Congress funding broken, inefficient, and, in many cases, downright harmful programs.

For instance, this bill reauthorizes the National Flood Insurance Program—a program that might sound nice, but it subsidizes beachfront properties right in the middle of dangerous flood plains, which is already in more than \$20 billion of debt to American taxpayers, for a full year, without a single reform. By the way, after every single time it has been reauthorized, for years running, I and others have been promised that the next time around, we will have an opportunity to offer amendments, and we will have an opportunity to reform the Flood Insurance Program. It can be reformed, and it must be reformed. We have been promised reforms for years, but this bill just reauthorizes it for a full year, without a single reform—not one.

This bill also maintains the broken status quo for overseas contingency operations. For those Americans who aren’t familiar with this term—or OCO, as it is sometimes described—this is the Pentagon’s increasingly unaccountable and widely abused slush fund, insulated from scrutiny by unchecked budget caps. The deal appropriates another \$71.5 billion for OCO, a \$4 billion increase just from last year alone. This, only days after America learned that civilian and military leaders have been lying to the American people for years across multiple Presidential administrations about our failures in Afghanistan.

Instead of reform or oversight, these bills would put another \$4.1 billion into

the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund and limit our ability to negotiate peace and bring the war in Afghanistan finally to an end. In an era of rampant fake news, even the media is outperforming Congress on this issue.

These bills include \$495 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a 13-percent increase from the last fiscal year, and the highest appropriation it has had in 17 years—all for a program that has been of particular detriment to my State of Utah. The LWCF has been used as a tool for the Federal Government to gradually acquire more and more land, even as it is failing to care for the lands that it already owns, with a current maintenance backlog of \$19.4 billion.

Worse, in addition to funding broken programs, it funds blatant, abusive cronyism. The bill reauthorizes the Export-Import Bank—Washington's favorite among favored banks—which doles out taxpayer-backed loans to help American exporters, and it does so for a full 7 years, without even so much of a word of debate. This, notwithstanding the fact that the Export-Import Bank has been the subject of very intense debate in this body for many years, and with good reason.

Why? Well, among other things, the biggest recipient of Export-Import Bank funds is Pemex—Mexico's infamous, corrupt, state-owned oil company. It is so corrupt, in fact, that its own employees collaborate with Mexico's drug cartels to facilitate the theft of their best oil and their refined petroleum products.

In fact, that theft has become so rampant in Mexico that there is a term coined to refer to that kind of theft. Those who engage in it are called "huachicoleros"—"huachicoleros." We are funding, and we are insulating from the ramifications of that theft, Pemex, a corrupt institution. It doesn't operate well, in part, because it is the victim of theft and in part because it is being backed up by the U.S. Government.

Ranked right after Pemex is the People's Republic of China, whose state-owned enterprises are granted generous taxpayer-backed financing for purchases they could fund through their own Communist government.

Say what you want about China, about U.S.-China relations on trade, about military issues related to China, whatever national security issues we might be concerned about with China, but I don't know many people—in fact, I don't know anyone outside of this town—who think the U.S. Government should be propping up China, should be giving up money for the Export-Import Bank, or otherwise, to China. That is not our job. That is not the role of the U.S. taxpayer, who works hard every day to earn money which then might be sent to a Communist government in China.

The reauthorization even includes provisions instructing the Export-Import Bank to pretend it is helping

Americans to compete against China at the same time it is sending that very government billions of dollars.

Then there is the extension of the Brand USA Act—a 7-year reauthorization of a government-chartered non-profit Brand USA—to use tens of millions of Federal dollars to advertise for tourism.

To top things off, a last-minute tax extender's deal was added to the package late Monday night, diverting billions of dollars on central economic planning and picking winners and losers in the marketplace. Over the next 10 years, this package provides about \$2.7 billion in tax benefits through programs that use the Tax Code to incentivize businesses to invest in government-selected neighborhoods, seeking to control the flow of investment instead of relying on the free market to make those decisions, and it includes naked handouts to cronyist special interests.

For example, it spends over \$2.1 billion for subsidies in the energy sector—not energy generally but to specific winners within the energy industry that this small handful of purported leaders in Congress have decided would benefit from the hard-working taxpayer dollars that would be doled out.

The bill, among other things, engages in awarding \$113 million for coal production on Indian land, \$331 million for facilities to refuel alternative fuel vehicles, and \$1.5 billion for biodiesel and renewable diesel tax credits, for instance. As if the Federal Government weren't already mired sufficiently in this area, this bill devotes even more.

Beyond these, it hands out \$187 million in writeoffs for owners of motor sport entertainment complexes, \$18 million in tax breaks for the production of movies and TV shows, and \$3 million in tax credits for the purchasers of two-wheeled, plug-in electric vehicles, just to name a few examples.

Not only that, but it features new levels of absurdity too. This deal actually includes a special interest bailout to make up for the failures of a faulty pension plan, while, at the same time, authorizing another pension plan to follow in its same footsteps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Congress authorized a group of coal miners' multiemployer pension plans under problematic rules, allowing them to underfund the plans by over 70 percent, but all the while, those pensions still promised their workers full benefits, setting up unreasonable expectations for their return on investment. Inevitably, they have not made up the shortfall, and now the taxpayers are being asked to bail them out.

In the very same bill in which we are bailing out the coal miners' pensions, we are authorizing a select group of

community newspapers—not all newspapers and not all media enterprises; just a select group of handpicked community newspapers—to follow the same practice, allowing them, once again, to underfund their workers' pensions while again promising them a full return on benefits.

With this bill, we are rubberstamping the expectation that employers are free to raid their workers' promised retirement benefits for their own short-term gain and setting the precedent that the government will reward this bad practice by bailing them out when that inevitably becomes a problem.

This bill, however, does include some good measures that I support, like repealing the medical device tax, fixing a tax provision that would unfairly subject churches to more taxes, and making retirement account reforms that allow Americans to access these funds in times of a particular need.

Sadly, I, like many of our colleagues, will be forced to vote against these measures because they have been lumped into this massive, stinking package where the only choice we have is a binary one. We have no option to vote for the things we like. This is wrong. There is no finite cap on our ability to debate these things other than the artificial ones we have created rather deliberately within this body, and that is wrong.

The thing about these omnibuses is they put us in a take-it-or-leave-it position. We were given no choice but to support or oppose the whole thing, good and bad measures alike. Unfortunately, just like every other episode in this squalid saga—I call this one omnibus 2—this one, too, will come to a predictable, sad, sorry ending. Congress will pass the mess, indulging in a process, substance, and long-term result that are all an affront to the viewers, because at the end of the day, the audience members are real live victims. We can do better. We can, we must, and we will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here with my good friend the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator SHELBY from Alabama. We worked hard on this bill, he as chairman and I as vice chairman. We reached a bipartisan, bicameral agreement that will fund the Federal Government in fiscal year 2020.

The agreement rejects some devastating and shortsighted cuts proposed by the President. It makes historic investments in the American people and working families. It fully implements the bipartisan budget agreement and allows us to invest an additional \$27 billion in nondefense programs to benefit our Nation's children, improve our educational institutions, protect our environment, combat the opioid crisis, promote and grow our economy, invest in our infrastructure, and protect our elections. There is a lot in here.

There are 12 appropriations bills put into 2 minibuses. The first, we refer to as the domestic minibus bill. That is a strong bipartisan bill that makes real and historic investments in the American people and our communities.

It rejects anti-science and know-nothingism proposals by making record-level investments in science and research programs. We all know that you have to invest in science and research, and you cannot turn this on and off year by year. We have to think long term.

We also have to invest in our children's education. We have increases in programs with proven success, such as Head Start, the child care and development block grant, child nutrition programs, 21st-century learning grants, Pell grants, and others.

For the third year in a row, it continues the historic level of funding to combat opioids that we began in fiscal year 2018. This funding is critical for State and local governments because they are at the frontlines of this battle.

The agreement provides over \$5 billion more than the President's budget to protect national parks and public lands and fund critical environmental protection and conservation programs. These national parks are an important part of our heritage. The Presiding Officer has some of the most beautiful ones in the country in his State, but all of our national parks are beautiful. I think about the brilliance of people like President Theodore Roosevelt who said: Let's preserve them.

Even though the administration denies that climate change exists, the agreement includes significant resources to combat this threat in the new fiscal year.

It rejects the President's proposal to totally eliminate key Federal affordable housing and economic development programs.

For the first time in decades, Congress has come together to fund \$25 million for gun violence research by the Centers for Disease Control and the NIH. That is a significant step to combat the gun violence epidemic and rash of school shootings facing our Nation.

It is a good bill. It is certainly going to improve the lives of Vermonters. It improves the lives of millions of Americans in all the States. It provides support for working families and supports and promotes our economy. In a few moments, we are going to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on this bill, and I will urge an "aye" vote.

The second package of bills, we refer to as the national security minibus bill. It is critical funding to support our troops, invest in our military, and protect our Nation from ongoing threats, both foreign and domestic.

Importantly, it includes \$425 million for election security grants. While the administration has not requested anything, I heard from secretaries of state—Republicans and Democrats alike—throughout the country, includ-

ing our own, Jim Condos of Vermont, of the need for these election security grants. It is a matter of national security to preserve our democracy, and we have to maintain full faith in our elections.

We also fund the constitutionally mandated 2020 Decennial Census. That is in the U.S. Constitution. It not only determines congressional apportionment, but it also is relied on to distribute \$900 billion in Federal funds. We have to have a fair and accurate count, and the money provided in this bill will help us achieve that.

We have significant investments to fight crime and terrorism, implement criminal justice reforms, combat violence against women, and keep communities safe.

We also have funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

I would note that we have one area that has been a lightning rod in both Chambers. We tried to get a bill that would receive the required number of votes to pass. The reason it has been difficult is because of the President's insistence that we waste taxpayer money on an ineffective and foolish wall on the southern border. We all want secure borders. A wall that can be easily cut with a \$100 power saw you can buy at a local hardware store is not security, and we worry about the cruel and ineffective immigration policies of the Trump Administration.

Last year, the President plunged us into a 35-day government shutdown when Congress refused to fund his anti-immigration agenda. That cost the taxpayers of this country billions of dollars that could have been spent on better things. But we reached a resolution. Again, I compliment Senator SHELBY and Congresswomen LOWEY and GRANGER because we met for hours in my office and worked our way through that.

In this bill, the President will receive \$1.375 billion for barriers on the southern border, which is what he would have received if we had a continuing resolution and far less than the \$8.6 billion he requested, \$5 billion of which would have come from the Department of Homeland Security.

I would have preferred no funding for the wall. President Trump's wall will negatively impact communities in which it is built, rob people of their property—in some cases, ranches and farmland that have been in families for generations—and destroy critical habitat on the border. But the Republicans were clear: They would not support a bill that contained zero for the wall. They stood with the President on the wall, as they seem to do time after time.

I am disappointed that we did not further restrict the President's ability to steal money from our troops to pay for the wall. If the President decides to once again steal money from our troops and their families for the wall, he will have to answer in court and to the American people. Our position on

this is clear: It is wrong. No one should interpret silence in this bill or the domestic minibus on this issue as condoning the President's actions or as an agreement that what he has done is lawful. It simply reflects a sad political reality that the Republican Party refuses to stand up to this President and protect the Congress's exclusive power of the purse and clarify the law.

One court has already correctly concluded that the President's raid on military construction money was unlawful. That conclusion is based on a long-standing provision of appropriations law, section 739 of the financial services bill, that prevents the administration from increasing funds for a program or activity requested in the budget above and beyond what was provided in an appropriations act. This provision is included again in the underlying bill, and we believe it was correctly interpreted.

We denied the President's request to increase the number of ICE detention beds to 54,000. This request was cruel and unjustified. Instead, we provided funding to support the same level of beds as fiscal year 2019. There is no need for a higher number.

President Trump is misusing ICE detention facilities for the mass incarceration of asylum seekers and immigrants who have no criminal history and pose no threat to our communities. There are more effective, less expensive, and more humane ways to enforce our immigration laws while immigrants go through judicial proceedings. That is why I fought for and secured a significant increase in alternatives to detention, like the Family Case Management Program.

I also fought to include restrictions on the President's ability to increase the bed number by transferring money from other accounts. But again, Republicans stood with the President and refused to negotiate on this issue, and those critical reforms were not included.

Not every part of the DHS bill is controversial, however. The bill provides critical funding for the Coast Guard to support their missions to keep our country safe. It provides an increase for the Transportation Security Administration, which ensures our safety and security at our Nation's busy airports, and it provides increased funding for FEMA whose mission is critical for communities struggling to recover in the wake of natural disasters.

While I do not agree with everything included in this bill, on balance, the security minibus provides funding important to keep our Nation safe, to support our troops, to improve election security, and ensure an accurate count for the Census. Later today, we will turn to this bill, and I urge an aye vote.

I do thank Chairman SHELBY for his hard work in negotiating the bills. The hours were long. We didn't always agree. We had a lot of weekends and evenings that we worked quietly out of

sight of the press and everything else, but knowing that we can take each other's word, we worked in good faith to reach a resolution on difficult matters. He made compromises necessary to get us a deal, as did I. And I thank my friend Senator SHELBY for his leadership on the Appropriations Committee.

I say this as Dean of the Senate and as somebody who has served with almost 20 percent of all the Senators in this country's history—I thank him for his friendship.

I thank the Appropriations Committee staff on both sides of the aisle. I might go home at 9 or 10 o'clock at night; they are still there until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning. They are hard-working, and there were sleepless nights. We could not have done this without them.

Obviously, I thank my full committee staff—Charles Kieffer, Chanda Betourney, Jessica Berry, Jay Tilton, and Hannah Chauvin—for their work, as well as Shannon Hines, Jonathan Graffeo, and David Adkins on Senator SHELBY's staff. I thank all the subcommittee. It is a long list, and I ask unanimous consent the entire list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VICE CHAIRMAN LEAHY LIST FOR SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1158 (CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020) AND H.R. 1865 (FURTHER CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020) STAFF FOR THE RECORD

Charles E. Kieffer, Chanda Betourney, Jay Tilton, Jessica Berry, Hannah Chauvin, Shannon Hines, Jonathan Graffeo, David Adkins, Margaret Pritchard, Dianne Nellor, Adrienne Wojciechowski, Teri Curtin, Bob Ross, Morgan Ulmer, Patrick Carroll, Elizabeth Dent, Anna Lanier Fischer, Jean Toal Eisen, Jennifer Eskra, Blaise Sheridan, Elisabeth Coats, Hamilton Bloom, Amber Beck, Allen Cutler, Matt Womble, Sydney Crawford, Erik Raven, Brigid Kolish, Rob Leonard, John Lucio, Andy Vanlandingham, Mike Clementi, Colleen Gaydos, Katy Hagan, Chris Hall, Hanz Heinrichs, Kate Kaufer, Rachel Littleton, Jacqui Russell, Jeremiah Van Aiken, Doug Clapp, Chris Hanson, Kathleen Williams, Tyler Owens, Jen Armstrong, Adam DeMella, Meyer Seligman, Molly Marsh, Ellen Murray, Diana Gourlay Hamilton, Reeves Hart, Andrew Newton, Brian Daner, Sophie Sando, Scott Nance, Chip Walgren, Drenan Dudley, Peter Babb, Chris Cook, Justin Harper, Thompson Moore, Kamela White, Christian Lee, Rachael Taylor, Ryan Hunt, Melissa Zimmerman, Faisal Amin, Emy Lesofski, Lucas Agnew, Nona McCoy, Alex Keenan, Mark Laisch, Kelly Brown, Kathryn Toomajian, Meghan Mott, Laura Friedel, Michael Gentile, Ashley Palmer, Jeff Reczek, Sarah Boliek, Alley Adcock, Michelle Dominguez, Jason McMahon, Patrick Magnuson, Jennifer Bastin, Joanne Hoff, Tim Rieser, Alex Carnes, Kali Farahmand, Paul Grove, Katherine Jackson, Sarita Vanka, Adam Yezerski, Dabney Hegg, Jessi Axe, Christina Monroe, Virginia Flores, Clare Doherty, Gus Maples, Rajat Mathur, LaShawnda Smith, Jason Woolwine, Courtney Young, Valerie Hutton, Elmer Myles, Penny Myles, Karin Thames, Robert Putnam, Clint Trocchio, Christy Greene, Blair Taylor, Jenny Winkler, Hong Nguyen, Christy Greene, George Castro.

Mr. LEAHY. I have often said that we Senators are merely constitutional impediments to the staff who do such great work, and I applaud them all on both sides of the aisle.

I yield the floor to my distinguished chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, just a few weeks ago right here, Congress passed a continuing resolution to fund the government through December 20. At that time, few if any of us predicted that we would pass all 12 appropriations bills in such a small window of time. Yet today we are poised to do just that in a few minutes.

Bipartisan cooperation has made this possible. Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member GRANGER on the House side and my friend Vice Chairman LEAHY and I on the Senate side worked together to change things. I believe that the four of us have shown once again that, if given the opportunity, we will find a bipartisan path forward to get the job done. It is very important that we do this.

I would be remiss right now if I did not recognize all members of the Appropriations Committees, Democrats and Republicans, committees on both sides of the aisle and the Capitol, our subcommittee chairs, our ranking members in particulars, and, of course, our staff. We would not be here without their diligence and willingness to work night and day with very little sleep.

I thank the leaders on both sides, Senator MCCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER.

I especially want to take a moment here to acknowledge the role played by the Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary Mnuchin, in these negotiations on behalf of the administration. Together, everybody negotiated the budget agreement that paved the way for these bills, and they helped guide them down the stretch. Secretary Mnuchin in particular has been a voice of reason and a driving force in our ability to get to yes, and we should be grateful for that.

I believe these bills are good bills that my colleagues can be proud to support. I do not have time here today to go into all the particulars of such a complex piece of legislation, but I want to hit a few high points as I see them. First—always first to me—is America's military, our national security, the security of our Nation. Defense spending here has increased by \$22 billion over the previous year. Our men and women in uniform will receive the largest pay increase in 10 years at 3.1 percent, which they deserve. Our veterans can rest assured that they will get the healthcare they earned and deserve through the funding of the VA MIS-

SION Act. These are victories for America and for the American people.

Turning to Homeland Security, which is very important, as well, \$1.375 billion is provided for the border wall system, and the President will have some greater flexibility on where he can build along the southern border. Not only that, but the President retains critical transfer authorities that will allow him to devote additional resources to border security and immigration enforcement. Again, the objective here and, I believe, the outcome is to make America strong.

The last thing that I will mention before wrapping up is that these bills will maintain all legacy policy riders to protect life and the Second Amendment. These provisions have long been foundational to the strength of America and I am proud to assure my colleagues that we can carry them forward.

All in all, these bills accommodate countless Members' priorities on both sides of the aisle. I want to thank all of my colleagues, again, for the input they provided at the outset of this process.

I also want to take a moment to thank my chief of staff and the staff director of the Appropriations Committee, Shannon Hines, and her staff for all the work they have done, as well as Senator LEAHY's staff, working together. As we approach the finish line, I ask for their support. As the clock winds down, let's come together and do what seemed so unlikely just a month ago—to fund the entire Federal Government before the Christmas break.

Before I yield the floor, I want to quickly thank, again, all of the staff for their hard work and dedication to make this happen today. Without them, it wouldn't happen and we know this. They have worked tirelessly on our behalf and on behalf of the American people, and we should all be grateful for their efforts.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1865, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Susan M. Collins, Richard Burr, David Perdue, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Boozman, Rob Portman, Richard C. Shelby, Roy Blunt, Jerry Moran, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Thom Tillis, Lisa Murkowski

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1865, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 71, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 413 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Grassley	Reed
Baldwin	Hassan	Roberts
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Hoeven	Rounds
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Jones	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Shaheen
Capito	King	Shelby
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Sullivan
Cornyn	McSally	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Thune
Cramer	Merkley	Tillis
Crapo	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Perdue	Wyden
Gardner	Peters	Young
Graham	Portman	

NAYS—21

Barrasso	Enzi	Lee
Blackburn	Ernst	Paul
Braun	Gillibrand	Risch
Carper	Hawley	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lankford	Toomey

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Udall
Cotton	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 71, the nays are 21.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The motion to refer fails.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to thank everybody for joining Senator SHELBY and I on this vote. It is going to help us move forward, and, as I said in my earlier remarks, Republicans and Democrats came together and worked

extraordinarily hard on these appropriations bills, and it shows what can be done when we work together. I think the vote here is an indication of that.

If nobody is seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PALLONE-THUNE TELEPHONE ROBOCALL ABUSE CRIMINAL ENFORCEMENT AND DETERRENCE ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today the Senate is taking the final step to send much-needed legislation to protect consumers from robocalls to the President's desk. I think we had hoped that this would be able to be passed with a couple of other bills coming out of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. I think the chairman of the committee, Senator WICKER, will address those later: the data mapping bill and the secure communications bill that deals with ensuring that we protect our technology from harmful elements—Huawei and those sorts of things. I would hope that we could get those cleared at some point, too.

Today, we want to proceed with the robocall bill.

I will just start by saying that illegal robocalls have flooded Americans' phones to the point where many folks don't want to answer their phones at all. In fact, a recent report found that only 47 percent of calls Americans receive are actually answered. This means consumers aren't answering legitimate calls that could be alerting you of fraud on your credit card, notifying you that your flight has been canceled, or reminding you of an upcoming medical appointment—all calls that are important to consumers.

It is clear that no one is immune to these annoying and potentially dangerous calls. Scammers use these calls to successfully prey on vulnerable populations, especially elderly Americans, and they target the kind of personal information that can be used to steal your money or your identity. When scammers are successful, the consequences for their victims can be devastating.

While there are laws and fines in place right now to prevent scam artists for preying on Americans through the telephone, these measures have been insufficient. When I served as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I subpoenaed the mass robocaller Adrian Abramovich to testify about his operation. His testimony made it clear that robocall scammers simply build the current fines into the cost of doing business.

On top of this, the Federal Communications Commission's enforcement efforts are hampered by a tight time window for pursuing violators. That is why, earlier this year, I introduced the legislation before us today, the Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act, or the TRACED Act, with my fellow Commerce Committee member, Senator MARKEY. The TRACED Act provides tools to discourage illegal robocalls, protect consumers, and crack down on offenders. It expands the window in which the FCC can pursue intentional scammers and levy fines from 1 year to 4 years.

The legislation also requires telephone service providers to adopt call verification technologies that would help prevent illegal robocalls from reaching consumers in the first place. The TRACED Act also recognizes the importance of legitimate calls and ensures important calls like emergency public safety calls are not wrongly blocked.

Importantly, it convenes a working group with representatives from the Department of Justice, the FCC, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, State attorneys general, and others to identify ways to criminally prosecute the illegal robocalling. TRACED also addresses the issue of so-called one-ring scams, where international scammers try to get individuals to return their calls so they can charge them exorbitant fees.

It directs the Federal Communications Commission to convene a working group to address the problem of illegal robocalls being made to hospitals.

Mr. President, I am very pleased that the TRACED Act received bipartisan support in both houses of Congress. I am especially grateful to Senator MARKEY for partnering with me on this legislation, and I appreciate Chairman WICKER and Ranking Member CANTWELL for quickly advancing this legislation through the Commerce Committee this year.

I also appreciate the work of our House colleagues, Representatives PALLONE, WALDEN, DOYLE, and LATTA, for their work on advancing the TRACED Act through the House. I am also very pleased this bill has attracted tremendous support from State governments and industry and consumer groups.

While the TRACED Act won't prevent all illegal robocalling, it is a big step in the right direction. As The Washington Post editorial board recently stated, the TRACED "is what good, old-fashioned legislating looks like." I could not agree more. No process is perfect, but today, I am excited that the Senate will be sending the TRACED Act to the President's desk.

Before I close, Mr. President, I would like to quickly thank several staff members whose efforts helped get us here today. In my office, I appreciate the work of Alex Sachtjen, Lauren

Greenwood, Jessica McBride, and Nick Rossi. I would also like to extend my thanks to Dan Ball, Olivia Trusty, John Keast, and Crystal Tully on Chairman WICKER's team, who worked tirelessly to help develop and advance this legislation.

As I mentioned before, I appreciate the great work of Senator MARKEY, his partnership on this bill, and I want to thank the work of Daniel Greene, Joey Wender, and Bennett Butler on his staff. This truly was, Mr. President, a team effort, so I thank you.

I look forward to the President's signature on the TRACED Act in the near future, and I hope that, as this bill gets implemented, it will once again be safe to answer your phone in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, thank you. This is a big day for consumers in the United States, and I want to begin first by thanking my friend, Senator THUNE, for his tremendous partnership on this legislation and the issue that we are discussing today, robocalls. That is because there are no blue robocalls. There are no red robocalls. There are only despised robocalls. That is what is bringing this Chamber together today. So I thank Senator THUNE for his great leadership.

I thank Senator WICKER and Senator CANTWELL for helping us to navigate this political pathway. Today is a big day. The daily deluge of robocalls that Americans experience is more than a nuisance in 2019. It is a consumer protection crisis. Today, the U.S. Senate is sending Americans a holiday gift on everyone's list: stopping the plague of robocalls. Americans across the country face an epidemic of illegal and fraudulent robocalls bombarding their phones.

While their telephones were once a reliable means of communications, they have been turned against us. They are now mechanisms for scammers and fraudsters who wish to cheat and to defraud. The numbers are staggering. In 2019, consumers have received an estimated 54 billion robocalls. That is 6 billion more than 2018, and we still have 2 more weeks to go. The year isn't even over. In November alone, an estimated 5 billion robocalls were made to Americans. That is 167 million robocalls per day. That is 7 million robocalls an hour. That is 2,000 every second in our country. In the time it takes me to make these remarks, 10,000 robocalls will have been placed across this country.

In 2019, already almost 600 million robocalls have been placed to my constituents in Massachusetts. Enough is enough. The reality is that we no longer have confidence in our phones. Our phones have become tools for fraud, for scams, for harassment mechanisms by which those with bad intent can access our homes, our purses, or even our pockets at any time. Caller ID is not trusted. Important calls go un-

answered. Innocent Americans are defrauded. Our seniors in particular are targeted.

Years ago, scammers needed expensive, sophisticated equipment to robocall and robotext consumers en masse. Today, they just need a smartphone to target thousands of phones an hour at relatively little expense, and readily available software permits them to spoof their numbers, which means their true caller ID is, in fact, concealed from the person picking up the phone. These new technologies allow illegal robocalls to conduct fraud anonymously, both depriving Federal regulators and consumers the ability to identify and to punish the culprit.

Today, the U.S. Senate is putting robocall relief in sight. I have been proud again to partner with Senator THUNE on the Telephone Robocall Abuse Criminal Enforcement and Deterrence Act, or TRACED Act for short. We introduced it earlier this year; today is the culmination of that work in partnership with the House of Representatives. Stopping robocalls requires a simple formula, which we have included in the TRACED Act: 1, authentication; 2, blocking; 3, enforcement.

First, this bill requires carriers to adopt call authentication technologies so they can verify that incoming calls are legitimate before they reach consumers' phones. This will be mandatory for phone carriers. Second, the Federal Communications Commission will require phone companies to block unverified calls at no charge to consumers. Third, we will increase from 1 year to 4 years the time for the Federal Communications Commission to pursue penalties for robocallers that intentionally violate the rules. This is a recipe for success. That is what our TRACED Act does.

At the same time, this bill also ensures that emergency public safety calls still go through. The bill we will vote on today has enormous support across the country: 54 State and Territory attorneys general, all commissioners at the Federal Communications Commission, and the Federal Trade Commission. Major industry associations and meeting consumer groups endorse the legislation and agree that the TRACED Act is an essential weapon in combating the rise of illegal, fraudulent robocalls.

This robocall legislation is a political Halley's Comet. It is something we can all gather around and learn from. The robocalls we receive every day are neither Democrat, nor Republican. They are a universal menace. They impact the elderly, the young, the small business owner, and the student. Our grandparents and neighbors, our teachers and our coworkers today, no one is spared from this consumer protection pandemic.

Senator THUNE and my efforts would not have been possible without the great work of groups like the National Consumer Law Center, AARP, Con-

sumer Reports, Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Action, the National Association of Attorneys General, USTelecom, CTIA, NTCA, and so many more groups. These groups join the chorus of countless Americans who raised their voices and called on Congress to pass this bipartisan common-sense legislation, and we thank you.

What I would like to do, as well as Senator THUNE, is to thank my staff, Joey Wender, who is sitting out here on the floor with me right now; and Bennett Butler, right over my shoulder; and Daniel Greene, who worked on it; for Alex Sachtjen, Daniel Ball, Olivia Trusty, Nick Rossi, Crystal Tully, from the majority staff, all partnered to make today possible. I just want to say, again, we can't thank Alex Sachtjen enough for all the work that was done.

I thank Senator THUNE, and I thank the entire Senate for their support for this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I appreciate that. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. He and his staff were tremendous in working on this. As I said before, it is nice when we have an opportunity to work in a bipartisan way on something that is this meaningful in people's lives. This has a tremendous impact on the daily life of Americans who are bombarded, in many cases, not just with annoying nuisance calls, but also with calls that are very predatory and particularly when it comes to some of our vulnerable populations.

Mr. President, notwithstanding rule XII, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 151.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 151) entitled "An Act to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes", do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment, and I know of no further debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the motion to concur?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that this be separate from the discussion that we are now having, but I would ask unanimous consent that at 12 p.m. today,

postcloture time on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1865 expire; the other pending motions and amendments be withdrawn; and Senator ENZI or his designee be recognized to raise a budget point of order, followed by Senator SHELBY or his designee to make a motion to waive the budget point of order; finally, if the motion to waive is agreed to, the Senate vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1865 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

I recognize the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Reserving the right to object.

Does that mean I won't get to give the comments before we vote? There has to be some comments about the point of order. Looking at the clock, the number of people waiting, it looks like I am being cut off of that time.

Would that be a correct interpretation?

Mr. THUNE. I would say my view here is that the gentleman from Wyoming wants to explain his point of order. There is no objection to allowing him to do that.

Mr. ENZI. Then I have no objection.

Mr. THUNE. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I recognize the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, the time is fleeting.

The distinguished Republican whip is correct. We had hoped that the robocall bill could be included with unanimous consent with two other very important pieces of legislation—one being the Broadband DATA Act, S. 1822, which is designed to tell the FCC: Go back. Get the maps right. Show us where we have coverage and where we do not have coverage. We are making great progress with that. I do believe we will get that bill passed in just a moment.

The other issue is the Huawei data security act. I understand we are going to have some trouble with that. Let me talk briefly before I make my unanimous consent request.

China is up to no good with their government-controlled companies, Huawei and ZTE. They are required by Chinese law to do the bidding of the Chinese Communist dictatorship, and that means using their equipment to spy on Americans.

This is an undisputed fact, and it is recognized not only by Americans but also by other countries, our allies, which are taking steps to protect themselves. Japan, Australia, New Zealand have already begun the process of removing this dangerous ZTE and Huawei equipment from their networks.

We have legislation we thought was going to be included in this three-bill

package, H.R. 4998, to authorize this in the United States.

Earlier this year, the President signed an Executive order declaring a national emergency—and I agree with the President—because of the dangerous effects of keeping Chinese equipment in our Nation's critical infrastructure. Given these threats, we have an opportunity today to remove this Huawei and ZTE equipment from American telecommunication networks so we can protect Americans.

We are going to have some trouble with that on the unanimous consent request. I think with the broadband DATA Act we will not.

(Mrs. FISCHER assumed the Chair.)

BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT ACCURACY AND TECHNOLOGICAL AVAILABILITY ACT

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 328, S. 1822.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1822) to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Broadband Deployment Accuracy and Technological Availability Act" or the "Broadband DATA Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.**—The term "broadband internet access service" has the meaning given the term in section 8.1(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(2) **BROADBAND MAP.**—The term "Broadband Map" means the map created by the Commission under section 3(c)(1)(A).

(3) **CELL EDGE PROBABILITY.**—The term "cell edge probability" means the likelihood that the minimum threshold download and upload speeds with respect to broadband internet access service will be met or exceeded at a distance from a base station that is intended to indicate the ultimate edge of the coverage area of a cell.

(4) **CELL LOADING.**—The term "cell loading" means the percentage of the available air interface resources of a base station that are used by consumers with respect to broadband internet access service.

(5) **CLUTTER.**—The term "clutter" means a natural or man-made surface feature that affects the propagation of a signal from a base station.

(6) **COMMISSION.**—The term "Commission" means the Federal Communications Commission.

(7) **FABRIC.**—The term "Fabric" means the Broadband Serviceable Location Fabric established under section 3(b)(1)(B).

(8) **FORM 477.**—The term "Form 477" means Form 477 of the Commission relating to local telephone competition and broadband reporting.

(9) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term "Indian Tribe" has the meaning given the term "Indian tribe" in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(10) **MOBILITY FUND PHASE II.**—The term "Mobility Fund Phase II" means the second phase of the proceeding to provide universal service support from the Mobility Fund (WC Docket No. 10-90; WT Docket No. 10-208).

(11) **PROPAGATION MODEL.**—The term "propagation model" means a mathematical formulation for the characterization of radio wave propagation as a function of frequency, distance, and other conditions.

(12) **PROVIDER.**—The term "provider" means a provider of fixed or mobile broadband internet access service.

(13) **SHAPEFILE.**—The term "shapefile" means a digital storage format containing geospatial or location-based data and attribute information—

(A) regarding the availability of broadband internet access service; and

(B) that can be viewed, edited, and mapped in geographic information system software.

(14) **STANDARD BROADBAND INSTALLATION.**—The term "standard broadband installation"—

(A) means the initiation by a provider of new fixed broadband internet access service with no charges or delays attributable to the extension of the network of the provider; and

(B) includes the initiation of fixed broadband internet access service through routine installation that can be completed not later than 10 business days after the date on which the service request is submitted.

SEC. 3. BROADBAND MAPS.

(a) **RULES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue final rules that shall—

(A) allow for the collection by the Commission of accurate and granular data, not less frequently than biannually—

(i) relating to the availability of terrestrial fixed, fixed wireless, satellite, and mobile broadband internet access service; and

(ii) that the Commission shall use to compile the maps created under subsection (c)(1) (referred to in this section as "coverage maps"), which the Commission shall make publicly available; and

(B) establish—

(i) processes through which the Commission can verify the accuracy of data submitted under subsection (b)(2);

(ii) processes and procedures through which the Commission, and, as necessary, other entities or persons submitting information under this Act, can protect the security, privacy, and confidentiality of—

(I) information contained in the Fabric;

(II) the dataset created under subsection (b)(1) supporting the Fabric; and

(III) the data submitted under subsection (b)(2);

(iv) the challenge process described in subsection (b)(5); and

(v) the process described in section 5(b).

(2) **OTHER DATA.**—In issuing the rules under paragraph (1), the Commission shall develop a process through which the Commission can collect verified data for use in the coverage maps from—

(A) State, local, and Tribal governmental entities that are primarily responsible for mapping or tracking broadband internet access service coverage for a State, unit of local government, or Indian Tribe, as applicable;

(B) third parties, if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest to use such data in—

(i) the development of the coverage maps; or

(ii) the verification of data submitted under subsection (b); and

(C) other Federal agencies.

(3) **UPDATES.**—The Commission shall revise the rules issued under paragraph (1) to—

(A) reflect changes in technology;

(B) ensure the accuracy of propagation models, as further provided in subsection (b)(3); and

(C) improve the usefulness of the coverage maps.

(b) **CONTENT OF RULES.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF A SERVICEABLE LOCATION FABRIC REGARDING FIXED BROADBAND.**—

(A) **DATASET.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall create a common dataset of all locations in the United States where fixed broadband internet access service can be installed, as determined by the Commission.

(ii) **CONTRACTING.**—

(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subclauses (II) and (III), the Commission may contract with an entity with expertise with respect to geographic information systems (referred to in this subsection as “GIS”) to create and maintain the dataset under clause (i).

(II) **APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.**—A contract into which the Commission enters under subclause (I) shall in all respects comply with applicable provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(III) **LIMITATIONS.**—With respect to a contract into which the Commission enters under subclause (I)—

(aa) the entity with which the Commission contracts shall be selected through a competitive bid process that is transparent and open; and

(bb) the contract shall be for a term of not longer than 5 years, after which the Commission may enter into a new contract—

(AA) with an entity, and for the purposes, described in subclause (I); and

(BB) that complies with the requirements under subclause (II) and this subclause.

(B) **FABRIC.**—The rules issued by the Commission under subsection (a)(1) shall establish the Broadband Serviceable Location Fabric, which shall—

(i) contain geocoded information for each location identified under subparagraph (A)(i);

(ii) serve as the foundation upon which all data relating to the availability of fixed broadband internet access service collected under paragraph (2)(A) shall be reported and overlaid;

(iii) be compatible with commonly used GIS software; and

(iv) at a minimum, be updated annually by the Commission.

(C) **IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITY.**—The Commission shall prioritize implementing the Fabric for rural and insular areas of the United States.

(2) **COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.**—The rules issued by the Commission under subsection (a)(1) shall include uniform standards for the reporting of broadband internet access service data that the Commission shall collect—

(A) from each provider of terrestrial fixed, fixed wireless, or satellite broadband internet access service, which shall include data that—

(i) documents the areas where the provider—

(I) has actually built out the broadband network infrastructure of the provider such that the provider is able to provide that service; and

(II) could provide that service, as determined by identifying where the provider is capable of performing a standard broadband installation, if applicable;

(ii) includes information regarding download and upload speeds, at various thresholds established by the Commission, and, if applicable, latency with respect to broadband internet access service that the provider makes available;

(iii) can be georeferenced to the GIS data in the Fabric;

(iv) the provider shall report as—

(I) with respect to providers of fixed wireless broadband internet access service—

(aa) propagation maps and propagation model details that—

(AA) satisfy standards that are similar to those applicable to providers of mobile broadband internet access service under subparagraph (B) with respect to propagation maps and propagation model details, taking into account material differences between fixed wireless and mobile broadband internet access service; and

(BB) reflect the speeds and latency of the service provided by the provider; or

(bb) a list of addresses or locations that constitute the service area of the provider, except that the Commission—

(AA) may only permit, and not require, a provider to report the data using that means of reporting; and

(BB) in the rules issued under subsection (a)(1), shall provide a method for using that means of reporting with respect to Tribal areas; and

(II) with respect to providers of terrestrial fixed and satellite broadband internet access service—

(aa) polygon shapefiles; or

(bb) a list of addresses or locations that constitute the service area of the provider, except that the Commission—

(AA) may only permit, and not require, a provider to report the data using that means of reporting; and

(BB) in the rules issued under subsection (a)(1), shall provide a method for using that means of reporting with respect to Tribal areas; and

(v) the Commission determines is appropriate with respect to certain technologies in order to ensure that the Broadband Map is granular and accurate; and

(B) from each provider of mobile broadband internet access service, which shall include propagation maps, and the propagation models on which those maps are based, that indicate the current (as of the date on which the information is collected) fourth generation Long-Term Evolution (commonly referred to as “4G LTE”) mobile broadband internet access service coverage of the provider, which shall—

(i) take into consideration the effect of clutter; and

(ii) satisfy—

(I) the requirements of having—

(aa) a download speed of 5 megabits per second and an upload speed of 1 megabit per second with a cell edge probability of not less than 90 percent; and

(bb) cell loading of 50 percent; and

(II) any other parameter that the Commission determines to be necessary to create a map under subsection (c)(1)(C) that is more precise than the map produced as a result of the submissions under the Mobility Fund Phase II information collection.

(3) **UPDATE OF REPORTING STANDARDS FOR MOBILE BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.**—For the purposes of paragraph (2)(B), if the Commission determines that the reporting standards under that paragraph are insufficient to collect accurate propagation maps and propagation model details with respect to future generations of mobile broadband internet access service technologies, the Commission shall immediately commence a rule making to adopt new reporting standards with respect to those technologies that—

(A) shall be the functional equivalent of the standards required under paragraph (2)(B); and

(B) allow for the collection of propagation maps and propagation model details that are as accurate and granular as, or more accurate and granular than, the maps and model details collected by the Commission under paragraph (2)(B).

(4) **CERTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION.**—With respect to a provider that submits information to the Commission under paragraph (2)—

(A) the provider shall include in each submission a certification from a corporate officer of the provider that the officer has examined the

information contained in the submission and that, to the best of the officer's actual knowledge, information, and belief, all statements of fact contained in the submission are true and correct; and

(B) the Commission shall verify the accuracy and reliability of the information in accordance with measures established by the Commission.

(5) **CHALLENGE PROCESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—In the rules issued under subsection (a), and subject to subparagraph (B), the Commission shall establish a user-friendly challenge process through which consumers, State, local, and Tribal governmental entities, and other entities may submit coverage data to the Commission to challenge the accuracy of—

(i) the coverage maps;

(ii) any information submitted by a provider regarding the availability of broadband internet access service; or

(iii) the information included in the Fabric.

(B) **CONSIDERATIONS; VERIFICATION; RESPONSE TO CHALLENGES.**—In establishing the challenge process required under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

(i) consider—

(I) the types of information that an entity submitting a challenge should provide to the Commission in support of the challenge;

(II) the appropriate level of granularity for the information described in subclause (I);

(III) the need to mitigate the time and expense incurred by, and the administrative burdens placed on, entities in—

(aa) challenging the accuracy of a coverage map; and

(bb) responding to challenges described in item (aa); and

(IV) the costs to consumers and providers resulting from a misallocation of funds because of a reliance on outdated or otherwise inaccurate information in the coverage maps;

(ii) include a process for verifying the data submitted through the challenge process in order to ensure the reliability of that data;

(iii) allow providers to respond to challenges submitted through the challenge process; and

(iv) develop an online mechanism, which—

(I) shall be integrated into the coverage maps; and

(II) allows for an entity described in subparagraph (A) to submit a challenge under the challenge process.

(C) **USE OF CHALLENGES.**—The rules issued to establish the challenge process under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a process for the speedy resolution of challenges; and

(ii) a process for the regular and expeditious updating of the coverage maps as challenges are resolved.

(6) **REFORM OF FORM 477 PROCESS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the rules issued under subsection (a) take effect, the Commission shall—

(i) reform the Form 477 broadband deployment service availability collection process of the Commission to make the process consistent with this Act and the rules issued under this Act; and

(ii) remove duplicative reporting requirements and procedures regarding the deployment of broadband internet access service that, as of that date, are in effect.

(B) **CONTINUED COLLECTION AND REPORTING.**—On and after the date on which the Commission carries out subparagraph (A), the Commission shall continue to collect and publicly report subscription data that the Commission collected through the Form 477 broadband deployment service availability process, as in effect on July 1, 2019.

(c) **MAPS.**—The Commission shall—

(I) create—

(A) the Broadband Map, which shall depict—

(i) the extent of the availability of broadband internet access service in the United States, without regard to whether that service is fixed

broadband internet access service or mobile broadband internet access service, which shall be based on data collected by the Commission from all providers; and

(ii) the areas of the United States that remain unserved by providers;

(B) a map that depicts the availability of fixed broadband internet access service, which shall be based on data collected by the Commission from providers under subsection (b)(2)(A); and

(C) a map that depicts the availability of mobile broadband internet access service, which shall be based on data collected by the Commission from providers under subsection (b)(2)(B);

(2) use the maps created under paragraph (1)—

(A) to determine the areas in which terrestrial fixed, fixed wireless, mobile, and satellite broadband internet access service is and is not available; and

(B) when making any new award of funding with respect to the deployment of broadband internet access service;

(3) update the maps created under paragraph (1) not less frequently than biannually using the most recent data collected from providers under subsection (b)(2);

(4) establish a process requiring the Department of Agriculture and the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to consult the maps created under paragraph (1) when, as of the date on which the process is established or on any future date, distributing funds relating to the deployment of broadband internet access service under any program administered by the Rural Utilities Service or the Administration, respectively; and

(5) establish a process to make the data collected under subsection (b)(2) available to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for a person or entity to willfully and knowingly, or recklessly, submit information or data under this Act that is materially inaccurate or incomplete with respect to the availability of broadband internet access service.

(b) VIOLATIONS.—A violation of this Act shall be treated as a violation of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.), and the Commission shall enforce this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of that Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

SEC. 5. IMPROVING DATA ACCURACY.

(a) AUDITS.—The Commission shall conduct regular audits of information submitted to the Commission by providers under section 3(b)(2) to ensure that the providers are complying with this Act.

(b) CROWDSOURCING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall develop a process through which persons in the United States may submit specific information about the deployment and availability of broadband internet access service in the United States so that the information may be used to verify and supplement information provided by providers of broadband internet access service for inclusion in the maps created under section 3(c)(1).

(2) COLLABORATION.—As part of the efforts of the Commission to facilitate the ability of persons to submit information under paragraph (1), the Commission shall issue guidance and other information as appropriate to ensure that the information submitted is uniform and consistent with the data submitted by providers under section 3(b)(2).

(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO INDIAN TRIBES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Commission shall hold workshops for Tribal governments in each of the 12 Bureau of Indian Affairs regions to provide technical assistance

with the collection and submission of data under section 3(a)(2).

(2) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Each year, the Commission, in consultation with Indian Tribes, shall review the need for continued workshops required under paragraph (1).

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Commission shall establish a process through which a provider that has fewer than 100,000 active broadband internet access service connections may request and receive assistance from the Commission with respect to geographic information system data processing to ensure that the provider is able to comply with the requirements under section 3(b) in a timely and accurate manner.

SEC. 6. COST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with the first full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall include in the budget submission of the Commission to the President under sections 1105(a) and 1108 of title 31, United States Code, amounts sufficient to ensure the proper and continued functioning of the responsibilities of the Commission under this Act.

(b) COST OF FABRIC.—

(1) USF.—The Commission may not use funds from the universal service programs of the Commission established under section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254), and the regulations issued under that section, to pay for any costs associated with this Act.

(2) OTHER FUNDS.—The Commission may recover costs associated with this Act under section 9 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 159) to the extent provided for in an appropriation Act, as required under subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 7. OTHER PROVISIONS.

(a) OMB.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the initial rule making required under section 3(a)(1) shall be exempt from review by the Office of Management and Budget.

(b) PRA.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”), shall not apply to the initial rule making required under section 3(a)(1).

(c) EXECUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.—Except as provided in section 3(b)(1)(A)(ii), the Commission—

(1) including the offices of the Commission, shall carry out the responsibilities assigned to the Commission under this Act; and

(2) may not delegate any of the responsibilities assigned to the Commission under this Act to any third party, including the Universal Service Administrative Company.

(d) REPORTING.—Each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that summarizes the implementation of this Act and associated enforcement activities conducted during the previous fiscal year.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be withdrawn; that the Wicker substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1268), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today’s RECORD under “Text of Amendments.”)

The bill (S. 1822), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4998

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, with regard to the so-called “Rip and Replace Act” that would facilitate the United States joining our allies and protecting us, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 4998, which was received from the House; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, this is clearly an effort to push through last-minute changes on a single bill.

In my view, these changes are reckless, unnecessary, and unwise, and in any event they were made without debate by Members of this body and specifically contrary to the manner in which this very same legislation was reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee.

I am glad to see the passage of a couple of pieces of legislation just now, including the TRACED Act, which will help us fight damaging robocalls. This is good legislation. I am also supportive of S. 1822, the Broadband DATA Act, which will require much needed updates to our broadband maps. These are good pieces of legislation. I am glad they are passed.

I am also very supportive of the legislation that is the subject of the immediate unanimous consent request; that is, the Commerce Committee’s reported version of S. 1625, the United States 5G Leadership Act.

This is an important bill. It would help us identify Huawei equipment posing an espionage risk in the United States. It will ban the use of Universal Service Fund dollars to purchase the equipment and help reimburse small companies for the costs associated with ripping and replacing vulnerable equipment.

This is an important bill, and it received careful consideration during the Senate Commerce Committee’s markup on July 24, 2019.

The version of this bill that passed the committee was supported unanimously by Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the aisle. That version required \$700 million to be set aside in a fund to help reimburse companies for Huawei equipment replacements. The bill specified that the source of this funding was to come from the proceeds of spectrum auctions. This was a smart and good and carefully tailored pay-for that did not add to our out-of-control Federal spending.

As currently written, the bill contains a reference to a reimbursement fund and assumes there will be reimbursements, but the bill does not specify how much funding is allocated, nor does it specify the source of these funds. I can only assume this means the House and Senate Appropriations Committees will default to authorizing new funds rather than using the smart pay-for that the Senate Commerce Committee unanimously and wisely agreed to in July.

For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1625

Mr. LEE. Madam President, notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1625 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments ordered reported by the Commerce Committee be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WICKER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, the Senator, my good friend from Utah, has asked unanimous consent that we pass the version of the bill I authored. Ordinarily, I would very much appreciate that. The problem with his request is that in this Congress, it prevents us from acting today to get to this ZTE and Huawei problem. We have a solution, and we need to get started on it.

Let me also make the point that some things are worth paying for, and protecting Americans, protecting our electronic system, our broadband communications from the Chinese-owned Huawei and ZTE is worth paying for.

What my unanimous consent request would have done, had the Senator not objected, is we would have passed the bill and leave the issue of how we fund it to another day. Perhaps the appropriators would have decided to appropriate money for it. Had they done so, they would have operated within the budget caps, as the Appropriations Committee has done, and found room, found some offsets, and paid for it that way.

The proposal I made, that was objected to by my friend from Utah, would also have left open the possibility of having a pay-for by the sale of some spectrum.

I regret that the Senator is objecting based on how we will pay for this very needed expenditure down the road. So I am compelled to object to my good friend's unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LEE. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, where I come from in Utah, \$700 million is a lot of money. Seven hundred million dollars is something we ought to worry about where we are going to get it.

It is not unreasonable for us to request that the House of Representatives agree to the language we unanimously, on a bipartisan basis, passed out of the Senate Commerce Committee.

In my mind, it is unfortunate that we are allowing the House of Representatives' unreasonable, unwarranted demand—a demand the chairman of the Commerce Committee himself acknowledges is one they shouldn't object to—to rule the day and prevent this legislation from becoming law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO BILL MURAT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise today with great pride to recognize and honor my chief of staff and dear friend Bill Murat, who will retire at the end of this year after 21 years of working in Congress.

It is a rare thing in Washington to work side by side with the same person for more than 20 years.

So on the eve of your retirement, Bill, I want to share a few words about how much you have meant to me and the countless others you have encountered during your long and storied career.

Bill Murat is a proud son of Stevens Point, WI. He graduated from high school and college there, earned his GD from UW Law School and his MBA from Columbia University.

Civically engaged since his youth, he served as district attorney for Portage County, WI, prior to his election to the Wisconsin State Assembly in 1994. It was there that Bill and I developed a friendship as colleagues in the Wisconsin State Assembly in the 1990s. I found him to be earnest, hard-working, a brilliant strategist, and lovely storyteller. He also knew when to add good humor or a note of levity.

I remember fondly one night, during a midnight session of the assembly, when Bill and I and a few of our Republican colleagues were on the floor waiting for a vote while many of our colleagues were still in their respective caucuses trying to hash out an agreement on an issue. Being a big fan of Broadway, Bill was reflecting on how this moment felt like a particular song from the musical "Oklahoma." There, on the floor of the Wisconsin State Assembly, while in recess in the wee hours, on a bipartisan basis, he broke

out in song, singing: "The farmer and the cowman should be friends." Because this is a speech about Bill Murat, this will not be the last time I mention show tunes.

After I was elected to the House of Representatives, Bill came to work with me, first, as my district director and then, starting in 2001, as my chief of staff. Bill's steady hand of leadership has helped me weather the storms Washington brings and stay focused on what matters most—the people we serve in Wisconsin.

I remember the days after September 11, 2001. It was chaotic, weighty, and, frankly, a scary time in Washington and across our Nation. I had to get back to Wisconsin, but planes were still grounded. So Bill walked into my office and simply said: "Need a ride?" So, together, we made that 14-hour trip home from Washington, DC, to Madison, WI, noting the American flags that were hung from nearly every highway bridge we passed under and considering the gravity of the new world we were seeing emerge.

Bill has been by my side for the highs and the lows of my time in Congress. I am so proud of what we have done together, working to do right by the people of Wisconsin and to pass on to the next generation a country that is more equal, not less. His generosity of spirit extends to every constituent in Wisconsin, every colleague in Congress, and every staffer who has worked for him. His door is always open, and he has been a mentor to so many people who have worked in the Baldwin offices over the years.

In fact, I know there are several former staff members of mine who have Bill to thank for their love of Broadway, since he used to host "Better Living through Show Tunes" as evening staff events. To be honest, I am still jealous that these show tune nights always happened after "wheels up" and I was headed home to Wisconsin.

On a more serious note, Bill is a fierce advocate and ardent supporter of our Team Tammy family. He has led by example, encouraging young people to pursue their passions, doling out career advice to those who need it and listening to the concerns of others, whether they are a Senate employee or a Wisconsinite looking for some assistance.

Bill has spent over three decades working on behalf of the great State of Wisconsin. He and I have accomplished much together. I would not be here today without him, and I am grateful for his friendship. I thank him from the bottom of my heart for the years of service, and I wish him the most fabulous retirement.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, very shortly, the Senate will vote on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to accompany H.R. 1865, Further Consolidated Appropriations Act. As part of this appropriations package, a

version of my bill, the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019, is included in section 903. This bipartisan bill seeks to restore U.S. court jurisdiction over the Palestinian Authority, PA/Palestine Liberation Organization, PLO, while promoting U.S. foreign policy interests in the Middle East through the resumption of U.S. security assistance to PA security forces. It is a testament to the hard work of my Democratic and Republican colleagues in this Chamber that we are about to take up this important legislation.

In 1992, Congress passed the Anti-Terrorism Act, ATA. This law, as well as future amending legislation, sought to deter and defeat international terrorism by giving American citizens who are victims of terrorism overseas the power to sue perpetrators in U.S. court. I was privileged to work with the original ATA's author, Senator GRASSLEY, in drafting the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019.

What our bill—also sponsored by Senators DUCKWORTH, COONS, BLUMENTHAL, and RUBIO—does is strike a balance between Congress's desire to provide a path forward for American victims of terror to have their day in court and the toleration by the Members of this body to allow the PA/PLO to conduct a very narrow scope of activities on U.S. soil—such as activities pertaining to official business at the United Nations, engagements with U.S. officials necessary to our national interest, and legal expenses related to adjudicating or resolving claims filed in U.S. courts—without consenting to personal jurisdiction in civil ATA cases. This delicate balance is supported by a bipartisan coalition of Members of Congress, the executive branch, and American victims of international terrorism and their families.

For 25 years, the Federal courts struck this balance by holding that the PLO's and PA's presence and activities in the United States subject them to jurisdiction in our courts unless they can demonstrate that their offices in the United States deal exclusively with the official business of the United Nations and that their activities in this country are commensurate with their special diplomatic need for being present here.

The courts correctly held that the PLO's and PA's fundraising and public relations activities such as press releases and public appearances, whether characterized as diplomatic public speaking or proselytizing, are not essential to their diplomatic functions at the United Nations Headquarters. The bill codifies the distinction recognized in these cases while giving the PLO and PA a clear choice. Unless they limit their presence to official business with the United Nations and their U.S. activities commensurate with their special diplomatic need to be in the United States, they will be consenting to personal jurisdiction in ATA cases.

In this regard, the exception in the language for “ancillary” activities is intended to permit only essential support or services that are absolutely necessary to facilitate the conduct of diplomatic activities expressly exempted in the bill.

By applying the bill to any case pending on or after August 30, 2016, we are making clear Congress's intent that courts have the power to restore jurisdiction in cases previously dismissed for lack of jurisdiction after years of litigation. It is to be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress to provide relief for victims of terrorism, and it specifies Congress's intent to enable victims to pursue justice without being subjected to repetitive, unnecessary, or protracted litigation, which would just reopen the pain that many Americans have already suffered through.

As the Congress finishes its final week of the first session of the 116th Congress, I look forward to voting in favor of this important legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, in October the Senate Judiciary Committee marked up and passed S. 2132, the Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019. I am happy to say that after further good faith negotiations among key stakeholders within and outside of Congress, a version of the bill is included in the appropriations package the Senate will soon consider.

I am proud to be a lead cosponsor of this bipartisan bill and to have helped lead it through the Judiciary Committee. Senator LANKFORD, who introduced this legislation, has tirelessly worked to get it across the finish line in the Senate. From day one of this effort, American victims of terrorism have had a tremendous ally in the Senator from Oklahoma and his staff, and I thank him for his leadership.

Earlier today, Senator LANKFORD discussed parts of this bipartisan legislation in greater detail. I would like to associate myself with his remarks.

I am also very grateful to Senators DUCKWORTH, RUBIO, BLUMENTHAL, and COONS for their support and work on behalf of victims.

It is not easy to find common ground here in the Senate, but there is one issue where we should all agree: Those who aid or carry out terrorist attacks overseas that kill or injure Americans should be held fully accountable in our justice system.

For over 25 years, the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1992, ATA, which I authored and Congress unanimously passed, has empowered American victims of international terrorism to bring lawsuits in Federal courts to vindicate their rights and obtain compensation for their injuries—providing some semblance of justice.

Equally important, these lawsuits disrupt and deter the financial support of terrorist organizations. By cutting terrorists' financial lifelines, the ATA

is a key part of the U.S. arsenal in fighting terrorism and protecting American citizens.

The 1992 law removed the jurisdictional hurdles that had for so long frustrated or outright prevented American victims' ability to seek justice in U.S. courts for attacks committed overseas. Congress passed the ATA in the wake of international terrorist attacks, including the Palestine Liberation Front's 1985 killing of Leon Klinghoffer, a Jewish American aboard the *Achille Lauro* cruise ship.

For 25 years the law worked as intended. The Palestine Liberation Organization, PLO, and Palestinian Authority themselves were repeatedly held to account in U.S. courts and paid a price for terrorist attacks that harmed or killed Americans. But starting in 2015, lower court decisions made it impossible for American victims injured abroad to hold sponsors of international terrorism accountable in our own courts. These decisions nullified the fundamental purpose of the ATA—to protect Americans wherever in the world they may be—and disrespected Congress's power to protect U.S. citizens and U.S. interests.

Last year, I introduced the bipartisan Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act of 2018, ATCA, in direct response to those court decisions, including *Sokolow v. PLO* in the second Circuit and *Livnat v. Palestinian Authority* in the DC Circuit. Congress passed the ATCA—once again, without objection—to restore jurisdiction and thereby finally secure justice for victims.

The ATCA expressed a clear principle: If the PLO and Palestinian Authority continued to maintain any office or facility in the United States, or accepted taxpayer-funded U.S. assistance, they would be answerable in our courts for perpetrating or supporting terrorism that harmed or killed Americans. The bipartisan bill was considered through regular order as a standalone bill, with markups in both Chambers, passed Congress without objection, and was signed into law by President Trump in October of 2018.

Shortly thereafter, instead of facing justice in our courts, the Palestinian Authority rejected all U.S.-backed humanitarian assistance provided to the West Bank and Gaza. In its zeal to dodge legal responsibility, the Palestinian Authority even prevented nongovernmental organization, NGO, from receiving U.S. assistance.

The Palestinian Authority's strategically overbroad interpretation of the ATCA harmed the very people it claims to represent on the international stage.

After inexcusable objections and delays—which I previously outlined on the Senate floor—the State Department finally began to constructively work with me and my colleagues to improve upon the ATCA, respond to the Palestinian Authority's actions, and finally remove the jurisdictional hurdles imposed on American victims by flawed court decisions.

The Promoting Security and Justice for Victims of Terrorism Act of 2019 is the product of those negotiations and enables victims of terrorism to vindicate their rights in U.S. courts. It also responds directly to the Palestinian Authority's shameful blocking of security assistance and humanitarian services. This bill marks a rare compromise reached by American victims of terrorism and the State Department.

I hope it in some way also sets a new precedent for our own State Department to continue working on behalf of and never again at odds with American victims.

During the bill's markup this past October, Senator COONS offered an amendment that I cosponsored to add another important means of securing jurisdiction in our courts over the PLO and Palestinian Authority: If they pay terrorists or families of terrorists who injured or killed Americans, then that reprehensible conduct will be grounds for jurisdiction in ATA cases. This is a sound addition to the bill to support the United States' global fight against terrorism, as reflected in years of legislation—most recently the Taylor Force Act. The PLO and Palestinian Authority's "pay to slay" policies are nothing short of an incitement for further acts of terrorism. Connecting these payments to jurisdiction in ATA cases is perhaps the least Congress should do to further discourage such conduct and protect Americans abroad.

The bill also sends a clear signal that Congress intends to empower courts to restore jurisdiction in cases previously dismissed.

The American principle that everyone deserves meaningful access to justice is as old as the Constitution itself. This bipartisan bill will reopen the courthouse doors to American victims and their families. I am grateful for its inclusion in the appropriations measure that the Senate will soon consider.

Once again, I want to thank Senator LANKFORD for his leadership and tireless work these past several months on behalf of American victims of terrorism.

Finally, I also want to thank Chairman GRAHAM for making this bill a priority in the Judiciary Committee. I now urge all of my colleagues' support for this important and bipartisan measure.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2020 Appropriations bill for the Departments of Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies. This bill is included in the appropriations package that is before this Chamber.

Let me begin my remarks by thanking Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY for their bipartisan leadership in successfully finishing the conference and advancing all of these appropriations bills to the Senate floor.

I also want to acknowledge the hard work and strong commitment of my friend and colleague Senator JACK

REED, the ranking member of the T-HUD Subcommittee. We have worked closely together in negotiating this bill and have crafted a truly bipartisan product.

The fiscal year 2020 transportation and housing appropriations bill provides \$74.3 billion to continue to improve our Nation's infrastructure and maintain HUD rental assistance for low-income seniors, homeless youths, and other vulnerable populations. This year, we once again faced the funding challenge of rising rental costs across the country and a reduction in the receipts from the Federal Housing Administration that are used to offset some of the spending in this bill.

However, we were successful in maintaining many of the Senate priorities in the final bill. For example, the bill provides \$1 billion for the highly effective and popular BUILD grant program, which has provided \$205 million in critical infrastructure improvements in Maine since 2009. In addition, the bill includes \$1.15 billion for bridge repair and rehabilitation, with a focus on those States with the greatest needs. The need for additional bridge funding is clear across the country and was highlighted in my home State of Maine by grant awards for projects such as the Station 46 Bridge and the Sarah Mildred Long Bridge.

The infrastructure funding in this bill not only addresses the transportation challenges we face but also creates jobs and economic growth in each and every one of our homes. The American Society of Civil Engineers' most recent report card from 2017 shows that America's infrastructure remains in poor condition with a grade of D+. This poor rating is not only detrimental for the movement of people and goods but also harmful from a safety perspective.

I am also particularly proud of the \$300 million for the third National Security Multi-Mission Vessel which will serve as the new training vessel for Maine Maritime Academy. The new NSMV will play a critical role in training the next generation of U.S. mariners. This new ship will ensure that cadets receive the training hours they need to graduate and join the workforce in the merchant marine, Navy, and Coast Guard.

Another important issue, particularly to Senator REED and me, is reducing lead paint in homes. That is of particular health concern to families with children under the age of 6. The bill provides \$290 million to combat lead hazards, a historic level of funding. Lead paint hazards are a significant concern for Maine families, as 57 percent of our housing stock was constructed prior to 1978, the year lead-based paint was banned. These grants will help communities protect children from the harmful lifelong effects of lead poisoning.

Finally, I do want to mention that the bill provides additional funding for the FAA's aviation safety programs in light of two Boeing crashes. This fund-

ing ensures that the agency has the necessary staff and training, as well as safety data reporting systems going forward. Our Committee remains focused on this issue to ensure that we maintain the Nation's safest airspace.

I appreciate the opportunity to present this important legislation to the Chamber. As we begin debate on the Transportation-HUD bill, I urge my colleagues to support the investments in this bill that benefit our communities all across this Nation and the families, veterans, children, and our seniors that rely on these programs.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today as a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee to express my support for this appropriations bill and to highlight a number of important provisions for both our national security and the State of Maine.

I would first like to thank Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member DURBIN, as well as Vice-Chairman LEAHY, for their work and leadership on the committee and their willingness to come together to complete what is a strong, bipartisan final bill.

The bipartisan work of the Defense Subcommittee is vitally important to ensure our men and women in uniform are able to fight and defend our Nation as well as deter potential adversaries. It also ensures our DOD civilians have the resources they need to support those servicemembers and keep our ships, planes, and vehicles at the ready.

The bill before us today supports a military pay increase of 3.1 percent—the largest in a decade. It also recognizes the value of our civilian workforce by also supporting an average pay increase of 3.1 percent for DOD civilians.

The bill recognizes the necessity of building and maintaining a strong Navy. It provides nearly \$24 billion for new Navy battle force ships, including more than \$5 billion for three DDG-51 destroyers. Looking ahead to next year, it also provides an additional \$390 million above the amount requested in the President's budget request for DDG-51 advanced procurement. This demonstrates Congress's intent that the Department sustain an aggressive growth rate for large surface combatants in fiscal year 2021 and beyond.

In Maine, we are very proud of the role that Bath Iron Works plays in contributing to our national security, building the finest ships in our fleet. This bill includes \$130 million to invest in our Nation's large surface combatant industrial base, ensuring Bath Iron Works can efficiently design and build our Navy's fleet long into the future.

BIW is known throughout the Navy for the high-quality of the ships they build, with many Sailors using our motto that "Bath Built is Best Built." BIW employs the finest shipbuilders, engineers, and designers in the world, and this bill rightly recognizes the great value that these tried-and-tested warships bring to the Navy.

This bill supports our nation's public shipyards, which are truly the backbone of our Navy's submarine fleet. It funds our Navy's maintenance activities, ensuring workers at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and other shipyards can carry out their work keeping our Nation's submarines at sea.

The bill also makes clear that the Navy should continue to invest in the very successful apprenticeship programs at our public shipyards—which has been incredibly successful at PNSY—as well as work to address the availability of Virginia-class submarine materials at our shipyards.

This bill makes critical investments in research and development programs, which are being carried out in partnership with research institutions, including the University of Maine. These programs include producing jet fuel from Maine's forest biomass; developing hybrid composite structures for the Navy; and funding for DOD to utilize UMaine's new 3D printer, the largest in the world, for cutting-edge defense research and rapid prototyping.

This bill invests in fifth-generation aircraft we need to deter Russia and China by funding 98 F-35 aircraft 20 more than initially requested by the Department. These advanced, stealthy jets are key to dominating the skies, and I am proud of Pratt and Whitney's contributions to the program through its construction of the F135 engine at its facility in North Berwick, ME. Additionally, the bill procures six CH-53K Heavy Lift helicopters for the Marine Corps. The rotating drive shafts are a critical moment of the aircraft and are produced at Hunting Dearborn's facility in Fryeburg, ME.

The National Guard provides our country with both a strategic and operational reserve which has proven itself time and time again. I applaud the bill's inclusion of \$1.3 billion to the National Guard and Reserve equipment account to help modernize our Reserve forces. It also notes the critical capability that the National Guard provides to State governments in DOD's cyber defense mission and urges the Department to ensure there are cyber capabilities within the Guard in every State.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise to express my concerns with H.R. 158, the appropriations package to fund the Department of Defense, the Census Bureau, the Department of Justice, NASA, the Treasury, and the Department of Homeland Security.

As a representative of many Federal employees in the State of Maryland and a member of the Appropriations Committee, I take the responsibility of funding the government extremely seriously. The decisions we make in the appropriations bills govern the operations of the Federal Government and its programs to serve the American people, keep them safe, and foster opportunity.

I have also been deeply disturbed by this Administration's efforts to disregard the appropriations bills that Congress has passed and the President has signed by transferring funds from one account to another and, in some cases, failing to spend duly appropriated dollars in a timely fashion. In order to assert Congress's authority to make the laws that the administration must faithfully execute, I have advocated for greater transparency through disclosure of the apportionment documents used by the Office of Management and Budget to plan spending schedules among agencies and for restrictions on the administration's authority to transfer funds between programs. We have seen that this President does not care about, congressional intent and will flout the law to use American taxpayer money build a border wall that he said Mexico would pay for. The funds appropriated by Congress cannot be not be allowed to be taken away and redirected on the whim of a President. So I am disappointed that this bill does not include meaningful restrictions on transfer authority.

It also does not include House language to require disclosure of apportionment documents—language that is similar to an amendment I offered that was passed on a bipartisan basis as part of a bill in the Budget Committee. I appreciate the hard-won provisions in the bill to bolster efforts to oversee and correct abuses in this administration's disgraceful detention policy that has separated children from their parents and funding for alternatives to detention family case management. The bill rightfully rejects the President's request to increase his ICE and Border Patrol forces and prohibits border fencing in environmentally sensitive areas. But I remain deeply concerned that the President still can—and judging by past actions, likely will—transfer resources to support his damaging agenda.

I am pleased that this bill provides a well-deserved 3.1 percent pay increase for Federal employees who serve our Nation admirably every day. I am a cosponsor of the legislation to do that and glad that it has been included in this bill. However, I am concerned that the bill does not include House-passed language to counter the President's Executive orders that undermine Federal employee collective bargaining and have resulted in a number of anti-worker contracts. Federal employees are prohibited from bargaining on wages and benefits, so they focus their efforts on improving the operations of their offices. We should not impede their efforts to establish better working conditions, protect the civil service from political reprisals, and arbitrate disputes between management and the rank-and-file. I will continue to fight for fair treatment of Federal workforce.

I appreciate the willingness of Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY to work with me and with Congress-

woman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON to provide the District of Columbia with funding to cover past inauguration and Fourth of July expenses. But I am deeply disappointed that the bill continues to include shameful political policy riders for the District of Columbia that place restrictions on how the District spends its own money. The U.S. Congress should stop acting like we run the city of Washington, DC. Elected officials from the District should be able to enact laws that address the needs of their constituents without Congress looking over their shoulder. As I stated during our full committee markup of the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations bill, we must remove these restrictions—which none of us would accept for our own States.

Despite my reservations about the bill, it does include funding for many important programs. It fully funds the First Step Act to implement needed criminal justice reform, rejects the President's request to eliminate the Legal Services Corporation, and includes resources for law enforcement to address crime and fight opioid and drug trafficking. It fully funds the Census, a constitutionally mandated effort to count everyone in the United States and ensure that every community receives the resources it needs. It rejects the President's cuts to a number of important programs at NASA Goddard in Maryland, including the PACE Program, W-FIRST, and carbon monitoring. These programs are essential to our understanding of the universe and to own world and have been on the Trump chopping block year after year. I will continue to fight to make sure they are adequately funded. It fully funds the James Webb Space Telescope, supports RESTORE-L, and increases the base budget for Earth Science. NOAA and NIST, which are also headquartered in Maryland, will receive modest increases instead of the Administration's proposed cuts. The bill also includes important funding for defense installations in Maryland. This funding, coupled with the National Defense Authorization Act, which I was proud to support and which included a military pay increase and for the first time paid parental leave for federal employees, will ensure that the men and women of the military will receive benefits they deserve. Finally, the bill rejects the President's request to eliminate the Economic Development Administration and preserves funding for cooperative agreements between the Minority Business Development Agency and Minority Business Development Centers—three of which serve Maryland.

I recognize that no bill is perfect and that appropriations bills require compromise. I respect the work that Chairman SHELBY, Vice Chairman LEAHY, and their staffs have put into this legislation and am grateful for their willingness to work with me on many Maryland priorities. However, I believe

that we must take steps to assert Congress's role in the appropriations process in the face of a President who is willing to disregard the laws we pass—and he signs—to further his individual agenda. Because this bill does not restrict the President's ability to flout Congress's stated intent, I regret that I cannot vote for it.

ALTERNATIVE FUEL MIXTURE CREDIT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN to discuss a tax provision included in the spending package currently before the Senate.

The tax title in this bill contains an important clarification to the alternative fuel mixture tax credit under section 6426(e). This credit is intended to promote the use of nontraditional fuels, such as compressed natural gas and biomass-based fuels, for transportation and other purposes. Unfortunately, some in the oil industry have sought to turn this credit on its head by claiming the credit for ordinary gasoline based on the amount of butane mixed in. Ranking Member WYDEN, is it correct that every gallon of gasoline produced in the United States includes some amount of butane?

Mr. WYDEN. That is correct. All gasoline includes butane and, as far as I am aware, always has. Adding butane during the gasoline refining process is simply how gasoline is produced. The idea that Congress intended oil companies to benefit from a credit intended to reduce our dependence on traditional gasoline by rewarding them for making traditional gasoline doesn't pass the commonsense test. This is why the Internal Revenue Service has correctly denied such claims. However, the oil industry is litigating this issue in the hopes of winning a nearly \$50 billion windfall for producing gasoline the same way they have for a century. Mr. Chairman, am I correct that Congress never intended for gasoline to qualify for this credit based on its butane content?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I can assure the Senator that it was never Congress's intent for gasoline to qualify for this tax credit. I was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee when the alternative fuel mixture credit was enacted in 2005 as part of a surface transportation bill. During that time, there was great interest in reducing our dependence on foreign oil and traditional fuels. The alternative fuel mixture credit was added to reduce that dependence, not to provide a handout to large oil and gas companies. The fact is, if anyone had thought oil companies could qualify for this credit they already engaged in, the credit would never have been enacted. Not only would I have objected on policy grounds, but the Joint Committee on Taxation's revenue score associated with the provision would have been so

large that its passage wouldn't have been feasible. What is more, if we had intended for butane mixed with gasoline to qualify when the credit was enacted in 2005, I don't understand why industry waited more than 10 years to start claiming the credit for doing what they have been doing for more than a century, as you point out.

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you for that background, Mr. Chairman. I agree with you that it is clear that the benefit some in the oil and gas industry are seeking from this provision is illegitimate. However, given the significant amount of taxpayer dollars at stake should these companies somehow prevail in litigation, it is also important for Congress to provide clarity in this area, to protect the public purse. The tax package under consideration in the spending bill addresses this by amending the alternative fuel mixture credit to more explicitly deny the credit for butane mixed with gasoline, consistent congressional intent. This clarification is effective for any claims filed on or after January 8, 2018, when the IRS issued a formal revenue ruling putting taxpayers on notice that a mixture of butane and gasoline does not qualify for the credit. However, this does not mean we agree that such mixtures prior to January 8, 2018, qualify for the credit, and, in fact, we are of the opinion that they do not. Do you agree Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I do agree. The IRS got the law correct when it issued Revenue Ruling 2018-2, and our clarification makes clear that it is our intent for the IRS interpretation of the law to be controlling for all claims. This is the basis of the "no inference" language in the bill that states: "Nothing contained in this subsection or the amendments made by this subsection shall be construed to create any inference as to a change in law or guidance in effect prior to enactment of this subsection."

I thank the ranking member for engaging in this colloquy to discuss this important issue and the clarification included in the pending appropriations bill.

Ms. BALDWIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I rise to raise a point of order on the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2020, which provides funding for eight appropriations subcommittees and includes numerous tax and healthcare provisions and other new legislation called "authorizations." That is code for bills that haven't been debated on the Senate floor. These are Christmas presents for everyone, all put on the Federal credit card, which is overspent already.

This legislation was unveiled Monday afternoon and totals more than 1,800 pages, and here we are on Thursday, with just hours to go before a government shutdown, being asked to vote on

a bill that has not been subject to amendment or debate and that the Congressional Budget Office tells us will increase deficits by more than \$400 billion over the next 10 years. Actually, by the time you add in interest costs to this debt, it is half a trillion in 10 years and \$2.1 trillion on 20 years. That is according to the Committee for Responsible Federal Budget, which added in that interest. They added it up. So that will be half a trillion dollars of new overspending in one vote, and what makes it so expensive is that we are trying to do something here to buy everybody's vote.

This bill completely bypassed regular order and violates nearly all the Senate self-imposed budget rules with its billions of dollars in giveaways and tax policy changes. We are legislating on funding bills. Legislation is supposed to be scrutinized differently, especially if they pay out real money.

I will remind my colleagues that our national debt stands at just over \$23 trillion, and the Congressional Budget Office tells us that the Federal deficits are already on track to exceed \$1 trillion this year and every year thereafter. That is besides this \$2.1 trillion add-on.

We should be talking about how to address the budgetary mess we are in, not pressing the gas on an unsustainable fiscal trajectory, which is exactly what this bill does. We are making promises that can't be fulfilled.

Now, some people will mention the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, but I need to emphasize and remind you that that boosted the economy. It created jobs, it increased wages, and it is bringing in more revenue than ever before—ever before. But we are spending it faster than it is coming in. So it is not a revenue problem. It is a spending problem.

Now, rather than an aberration, busting has become commonplace. This is the second time this week that I have come to the floor to raise a point of order against legislation that violates the budget. But to be fair, from a budget perspective, this bill is exponentially worse than the Defense authorization bill we considered earlier this year. It is at least 50 times worse.

I oppose this legislation. I oppose adding to the already massive debt burden being placed on future generations.

The pending measure, the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1865, the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2020, would cause a deficit increase of more than \$5 billion in each of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in fiscal year 2030. This increase violates section 3101 of the 2016 budget resolution. Therefore, I raise a point of order under section 3101(b) of S. Con. Res. 11, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016.

I have been here long enough to know that you will now hear a list of wonderful things that are on this bill. You will not hear how to pay for all of these Christmas presents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

VOTE ON MOTION TO WAIVE

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of consideration of the message to accompany H.R. 1865, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Under the previous order, the motion to concur with the amendment is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 414 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Grassley	Reed
Baldwin	Hassan	Roberts
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Burr	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Shelby
Capito	Leahy	Sinema
Cardin	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McConnell	Thune
Coons	McSally	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Cramer	Merkley	Van Hollen
Crapo	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Wicker
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Gardner	Peters	
Graham	Portman	

NAYS—30

Barrasso	Ernst	Perdue
Blackburn	Fischer	Risch
Braun	Gillibrand	Romney
Carper	Hawley	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Tester
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	Paul	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Harris	Klobuchar	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 415 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Grassley	Roberts
Baldwin	Hassan	Romney
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Burr	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Shelby
Capito	Leahy	Sinema
Cardin	Manchin	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McConnell	Sullivan
Coons	McSally	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Thune
Cramer	Merkley	Tillis
Crapo	Moran	Udall
Duckworth	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Ernst	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Perdue	Wicker
Fischer	Peters	Wyden
Gardner	Portman	Young
Graham	Reed	

NAYS—23

Barrasso	Daines	Lee
Blackburn	Enzi	Paul
Braun	Gillibrand	Risch
Carper	Hawley	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Toomey
Cruz	Lankford	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Harris	Klobuchar	Warren

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Singhal nomination; further, that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmations of the nominations under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anuraag Singhal, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3104

Mr. SCHATZ. As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of S. 3104, the Federal Employee Parental Leave Technical Correction Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Reserving the right to object, let me explain what is going on here.

My colleague from Hawaii has an amendment that he would like to make to the NDAA legislation that we passed recently. It has been described by our Democratic colleagues as a technical correction.

Well, I have a technical correction that I would like to have considered as well. So I think we have a good solution where we can both get the technical corrections we would like. We have been waiting on mine for 2 years, but the good news is that we have broad bipartisan support for mine. Every Republican Senator supports it, and 13 Democrats are cosponsors of my legislation to make this technical correction. If my math is right, that means 66 Senators support doing this. There is huge bipartisan support in the House. So I would say let's fix both problems. The fix that I have in mind is to fix a drafting error from our tax reform bill from 2 years ago, and specifically, it would be to restore the ability of people who make leasehold improvements to fully expense that at the time it occurs.

That was always the intent. Nobody disputes that that was the intent, but because of a drafting error, when someone makes a leasehold improvement, not only are they unable to expense it in the year in which it incurs, but they have to depreciate it over 39 years, the exact opposite of our intention. This is a huge problem for restaurants and retailers generally, and every one of our States has how many retailers, how many restaurants that are adversely affected today by this technical error, and it is having an economic impact.

This category of business investment is the only category that has declined over the last year. It was down almost

4 percent in the third quarter. That is because of the adverse tax treatment. That is not good for any of us. It is not good for the United States. It is not good for our States. In the omnibus bill that we just passed, we had all kinds of tax provisions—\$427 billion, actually, worth of tax provisions announced at 2 in the morning on Tuesday, by the way.

It has things, including a resurrection of a special tax rule that was supposed to die in 2017. We are going to send checks to people for what they did in 2018, which will have no impact whatsoever, obviously, on changing incentives since it is the past. We did that. We reversed a deal that was struck in 2015 to phase out expensive renewable energy credits. We made two changes to the tax reform of 2017, but we weren't able to include the technical fix that 66 Senators want that would cost zero.

What we were told by our Democratic colleagues is that, if you want to do that, there is a price you have to pay. The price would be tens of billions of dollars of increases in refundable tax credits. That is checks being sent to people who don't pay taxes. Ranking Member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN, said just this week: "Democrats have long said the Republicans need to negotiate on broader issues if they want to fix all the mistakes in their tax giveaway." In other words, there has to be a price.

Well, if I were adopting the approach of my Democratic colleagues—and when my colleague from Hawaii comes down and makes this request—I could say, Well, you need to come up with \$50 billion worth of Republican priorities, maybe \$50 billion worth of capital gain tax cuts, or \$50 billion in reduction in some kind of mandatory spending or something. That is what I would do if I were taking the exact same approach that our Democratic colleagues took.

I am not going to do that. I am going to suggest that we both get what we are after here, and the American people get the benefit. Here is what I am going to do. I am going to modify the unanimous consent request. The way I am going to do that is to take the bill advocated by the Senator from Hawaii, drop it into a legislative vehicle, add the technical fix that I and 66 Senators support—and, by the way, 297 House Members have cosponsored the companion legislation, including 145 Democrat House Members—I am going to put them together in an otherwise empty legislative vehicle so that we can do both. When we pass it here in the Senate by unanimous consent in just a moment, if we do, then the House would virtually be assured of passage, since 297 House Members have cosponsored this legislation.

Mr. President, my suggestion is we modify this unanimous consent request so that the Senator from Hawaii gets the provision that he wants and I get the provision that 66 Senators want.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 748

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify his request so that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 157, H.R. 748. I further ask unanimous consent that the Toomey amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Let's get clear about what is happening here. The first thing is we did something momentous as a group. We, on a bipartisan basis, decided to provide paid parental leave of 12 weeks for the Federal workforce—2.1 million Federal workers—so that individuals who are new parents don't have to make that impossible choice between receiving a paycheck and being a new dad or a new mom. Now, this is catching us up with the rest of the world. The rest of the industrialized world understands that this isn't just a humane thing to do for families. This is the right way to manage the workforce because you get higher productivity; you get better morale; and you get lower turnover. This is a smart thing to do.

There were 2.1 million people covered by this momentous change of Federal policy agreed upon over the last 48 hours on a bipartisan basis. There was a technical problem, and so the following Federal employees are not going to be covered unless we make this technical fix: employees of the DC courts, public defenders, Presidential appointees, FAA, and CSA employees, and article I judges. Everybody else is going to get 12 weeks of paid parental leave, except for these people. We can solve that today.

That is what my unanimous consent request is all about. What the Senator from Pennsylvania has decided to do is take a hostage and say, These are the only Federal employees who are not going to get this benefit because of a technical and drafting error because I didn't get something totally unrelated that has to do with a tax bill that was passed on purely partisan lines in a hurry, written primarily by lobbyists in the middle of the night.

Now, I do not mind entertaining a change to the Tax Code to deal with this question of how you expense the renovation of restaurants and retail operations, but I think Senator WYDEN is exactly right. I guess the Senator from Pennsylvania thought this was a talking point on the Republican side. Heaven forbid if there should be a negotiation. Heaven forbid something that is as important to the Republicans that is as a result of their screw-up and would cost tens of billions of dollars would not be given away for free.

The argument being made is, hey, technical for technical. This is an ac-

tual technical fix. This is a bill we just enacted in the last 48 hours. I am not even sure if the President has signed it yet, but it is about to be enacted into law, and nobody is arguing that we should not cover some small portion of the Federal workforce.

Nobody is arguing that was the legislative intent. Nobody is arguing that is public policy. What the Senator from Pennsylvania is saying, If I don't get my thing, then these people don't get the help that they deserve. These people, by happenstance of a drafting error, don't get paid parental leave. Now, this has human consequences.

I object to the Senator's modification of my unanimous consent request, and I am deeply disappointed that we can't fix this simple thing. I am happy to work with the Senator from Pennsylvania on a quick fix. I think we will get there at some point next year, but this has to be part of a broader bipartisan deal, and he knows that.

This is going to cost tens of billions of dollars, and no one gives tens of billions of dollars for nothing. Everything of that magnitude has to be negotiated on a bipartisan, bicameral basis. That is not what he is trying to do. He is trying to say because we made a technical error that was monumentally wrong and, as a result of the flawed process, why don't we trade technical fixes. This is a relatively small technical fix, and he wants to trade it for a massive technical fix that is now 2 years old.

The only thing I would say is this may be small in the context of how we operate in the U.S. Senate. It is not small if you work for the FAA and you are a new dad. It is not small if you are an article I judge and you are a new mom. It is not small for these people who deserve paid parental leave like every other Federal employee will get soon.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I am kind of shocked by what I just heard, that I am characterized as taking a hostage. Let's just be very clear. I am the Senator on the floor who is proposing that both Senators get their way, that the outcome works for both sides. This is a Democratic priority. Some Republicans support it; some don't. It is a Democratic priority on a mistake that was made, and I am suggesting let's fix it.

Let's take the opportunity to also fix something that 66 Senators have supported. They cosponsored it. There is even broader support—much broader in the House where it is massive. I do not know what is more reasonable than a very broadly bipartisan technical fix that scores at zero and helps every single community in America and tying that with an opportunity to do something that is a very high priority for my colleague from Hawaii.

Since my colleague from Hawaii refuses to allow us both to be able to accomplish this, I am going to have to hope that we can do it another time, and I will object to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

DECEMBER 19

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on another subject, even though I am very close to this subject in that I chaired the Armed Services Committee, and that is where all of this really began, I do want to mention one thing about what happened this morning. I think our leader over here, Mr. McCONNELL, did a superb job. He made it very clear on the impeachment that took place last night. It is something that has not happened before. It is the first time it has happened, in that there is no impeachable offense, and it is nonetheless, I think, all driven by hatred. When you stop to think, here it is right before Christmas, and the hatred that is driving that, it is wrong.

I want to mention something that is significant, that you haven't thought of, I say to the Presiding Officer. That is, this 153rd day of the year is very significant. That is December 19. People have not stopped to realize the significant things that have happened on December 19 throughout our history and the history of the world, going all the way back to December 19, at 11:54, Henry II became King of England. We haven't really thought about the fact what does that mean to us today, but we will before long.

In 1843, December 19, again, Charles Dickens wrote "A Christmas Carol." It is the most watched, listened to, and sung event every Christmas.

In 1932, December 19, the British Broadcasting Corporation, the BBC, began transmitting overseas. That was the beginning of a whole new world of knowledge and understanding.

In 1950, December 19, NATO named General Dwight D. Eisenhower as supreme commander of the Western European defense forces.

Then in 1972, December 19, Apollo 17, the last of the Apollo moon landings returned to earth.

December 19 of 1984—I remember this well because I was in Hong Kong when this happened—that was when China signed an accord returning Hong Kong to the Chinese sovereignty. A lot of people thought it was good at the time to accept people from Hong Kong. I was there, and look what has happened now after all these years. I would have to say that hysteria has continued to this day.

Then, in 1998, December 19, the U.S. President Bill Clinton was impeached. I was there at that one, too. We have something to compare it with now, but that was December 19, 1998.

The event that is more significant by a landslide is what happened on December 19, 1959. On December 19, 1959, my wife Kay and I got married. That makes this the 60th anniversary of our

wedding. Just look at all the beauty that has followed us, 20 kids and grandkids. All of that in that 60-year period of time.

What I want to say is the beautiful life that we are still having together—and I would like to say at this point that Kay, after 60 years, is still loving, and I wish you a happy anniversary; and to everyone out there as you celebrate the birth of Jesus, Merry Christmas, and God bless you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF STEPHANIE DAWKINS DAVIS

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Stephanie Dawkins Davis for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

I had the honor of introducing Judge Dawkins Davis at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing more than 6 months ago. As I told the members of the committee, Judge Dawkins Davis is a highly respected member of the Michigan legal community, and she will serve our State well as a district court judge.

Judge Dawkins Davis has been an exemplary public servant who has worked hard and honorably to serve the people of Michigan. She has earned the respect of colleagues across the State and has garnered numerous awards throughout her career.

She began her career as a civil defense attorney at Dickinson Wright and later joined the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan, prosecuting cases at both the trial and appellate levels. She also spent time as a deputy unit chief of the Controlled Substances Unit and as a high intensity drug trafficking area liaison.

Her successful work led to her appointment as executive assistant U.S. attorney, and after that, she became a magistrate judge for the Eastern District and was selected to serve at the Flint Federal courthouse.

Judge Dawkins Davis is a qualified jurist. The American Bar Association unanimously rated her as "well qualified." She was also the first African-American woman nominated by President Trump for a Federal judgeship.

I am proud to recognize Judge Dawkins Davis for her many accomplishments and for the diverse voice and perspective she will bring to the bench.

This seat has been vacant since October 26, 2016; that is more than 3 years. It is past time that the Senate consider Judge Dawkins Davis's nomination, and I am glad it is finally happening today.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON SINGHAL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Singhal nomination?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 416 Ex.]

YEAS—76

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Feinstein	Perdue
Blackburn	Fischer	Peters
Blumenthal	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hassan	Romney
Brown	Hawley	Rosen
Burr	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Casey	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	McSally	Warner
Daines	Menendez	Wicker
Duckworth	Moran	Young
Durbin	Murkowski	
Enzi	Murphy	

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Markey	Stabenow
Bennet	Merkley	Udall
Cantwell	Murray	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Schatz	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Schumer	Wyden
Hirono	Smith	

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Roberts	
Isakson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I just cut off a Member of our own side because they didn't get here in time. That is to underscore that by popular demand, everybody wants these times to be kept, and that is what we intend to do.

I ask unanimous consent that the votes in this series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Karen Spencer Marston, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Marston nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced— yeas 87, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 417 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Feinstein	Perdue
Baldwin	Fischer	Peters
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blumenthal	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoehen	Rubio
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Jones	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Stabenow
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—6

Gillibrand	Merkley	Smith
Markey	Schumer	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Isakson	Warren
Burr	Klobuchar	
Harris	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Traynor nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 418 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoehen	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	McConnell	Thune
Crapo	McSally	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Cotton	Merkley	Udall
Cramer	Murphy	Van Hollen
Crapo	Murray	Whitehouse
Cruz	Moran	Wyden
Daines	Peters	
Duckworth		
Durbin		
Feinstein		
Gillibrand		

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Warner
Burr	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Dishman nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jodi W. Dishman, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Dishman nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 419 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Alexander	Ernst	Paul
Barrasso	Feinstein	Perdue
Bennet	Fischer	Peters
Blackburn	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Reed
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Braun	Hassan	Roberts
Brown	Hawley	Romney
Capito	Hoehen	Rosen
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Carper	Inhofe	Rubio
Casey	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Coons	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cornyn	King	Shelby
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sinema
Cotton	Leahy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Young

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Markey	Smith
Blumenthal	Menendez	Stabenow
Cantwell	Merkley	Udall
Gillibrand	Murray	Van Hollen
Heinrich	Schatz	Wyden
Hirono	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Warner
Burr	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Gallagher nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination John M. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gallagher nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 420 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Alexander	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blumenthal	Hassan	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Heinrich	Rosen
Braun	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Casey	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Kaine	Shaheen
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Coons	King	Sinema
Cornyn	Lankford	Smith
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murphy	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Wyden
Feinstein	Perdue	Young

NAYS—9

Bennet	Markey	Schumer
Cantwell	Merkley	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Warner
Burr	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Jones nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernard Maurice Jones II, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Jones nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 421 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeben	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Jones	Shaheen
Cardin	Kaine	Shelby
Carper	Kennedy	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Cassidy	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Tillis
Cotton	McSally	Toomey
Cramer	Menendez	Udall
Crapo	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cruz	Moran	Warner
Daines	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wicker
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Enzi	Paul	Young
Ernst	Perdue	
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—3

Gillibrand	Markey	Schumer
------------	--------	---------

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Harris	Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Mary Kay Vyskocil, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Vyskocil nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 422 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Alexander	Fischer	Reed
Baldwin	Gardner	Risch
Barrasso	Graham	Roberts
Bennet	Grassley	Romney
Blackburn	Hassan	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Hirono	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeben	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Brown	Inhofe	Schumer
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Jones	Scott (SC)
Capito	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	Kennedy	Shelby
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Lankford	Smith
Cassidy	Leahy	Stabenow
Collins	Lee	Sullivan
Coons	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	McConnell	Thune
Cortez Masto	McSally	Tillis
Cotton	Menendez	Toomey
Cramer	Merkley	Udall
Crapo	Moran	Van Hollen
Cruz	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murray	Wicker
Durbin	Paul	Wyden
Enzi	Perdue	Young
Ernst	Peters	
Feinstein	Portman	

NAYS—3

Gillibrand	Heinrich	Markey
------------	----------	--------

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Harris	Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kea Whetzal Riggs, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Riggs nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 423 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Inhofe	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Udall
Cruz	Merkley	Van Hollen
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Enzi	Murray	Wyden
Ernst	Paul	Young
Feinstein	Perdue	
Fischer	Peters	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Harris	Klobuchar	Warren

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to Executive Calendar No. 550 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Davis nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Biegun nomination and vote on confirmation of the nomination; finally, if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Biegun nomination, the Senate proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 1158; that if cloture is invoked on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1158, the postcloture time be expired, the other pending motions and amendments be withdrawn, and the Senate vote on adoption of the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1158 with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert J. Colville, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 424 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Grassley	Peters
Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Roberts
Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Brown	Johnson	Schatz
Burr	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kennedy	Shaheen
Carper	King	Shelby
Casey	Leahy	Sinema
Cassidy	Manchin	Smith
Collins	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McConnell	Tester
Cornyn	McSally	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Crapo	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Gillibrand	Murray	Wyden
Graham	Perdue	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Enzi	Risch
Blackburn	Ernst	Romney
Boozman	Fischer	Rounds
Braun	Gardner	Rubio
Capito	Hawley	Sasse
Cotton	Hoeven	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Inhofe	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Paul	
Isakson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lewis J. Liman, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Liman nomination?

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask for yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 425 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Alexander	Hassan	Roberts
Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Blunt	Jones	Scott (FL)
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Burr	King	Shelby
Cantwell	Leahy	Sinema
Cardin	Manchin	Smith
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McConnell	Tester
Collins	McSally	Tillis
Coons	Menendez	Toomey
Cornyn	Merkley	Udall
Cortez Masto	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Perdue	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young
Graham	Portman	
Grassley	Reed	

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Daines	Lee
Blackburn	Ernst	Risch
Boozman	Fischer	Romney
Braun	Gardner	Rounds
Capito	Hawley	Rubio
Cassidy	Hoeven	Sasse
Cotton	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Paul	
Isakson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Gary Richard Brown, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brown nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Dawkins Davis nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Stephen E. Biegun, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Biegun nomination?

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 426 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Feinstein	Portman
Baldwin	Fischer	Reed
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Bennet	Graham	Roberts
Blackburn	Grassley	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Blunt	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Braun	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Burr	Inhofe	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Lankford	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Thune
Cotton	McSally	Tillis
Cramer	Menendez	Toomey
Crapo	Merkley	Udall
Cruz	Moran	Van Hollen
Daines	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Enzi	Perdue	Wyden
Ernst	Peters	Young

NAYS—3

Gillibrand	Hirono	Markey
------------	--------	--------

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Paul	
Isakson	Sanders	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DHS CYBER INCIDENT RESPONSE TEAMS ACT OF 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

The Senate resumed consideration of the House message to H.R. 1158, a bill to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1263 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 1264 (to Amendment No. 1263), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1265, to change the enactment date.

McConnell Amendment No. 1266 (the instructions (Amendment No. 1265) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell Amendment No. 1267 (to Amendment No. 1266), of a perfecting nature.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1158, a bill to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Susan M. Collins, Richard Burr, David Perdue, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Boozman, Rob Portman, Richard C. Shelby, Roy Blunt, Jerry Moran, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Thom Tillis, Lisa Murkowski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the motion

to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1158, a bill (H.R. 1158) entitled "An Act to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes," shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 427 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Gardner	Reed
Baldwin	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Bennet	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Jones	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Sinema
Coons	Leahy	Smith
Cornyn	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Sullivan
Cotton	McSally	Tester
Cramer	Menendez	Thune
Crapo	Moran	Tillis
Daines	Murkowski	Udall
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Enzi	Perdue	Wicker
Feinstein	Peters	Young
Fischer	Portman	

NAYS—16

Blackburn	Gillibrand	Schumer
Braun	Hawley	Toomey
Carper	Johnson	Van Hollen
Cassidy	Lee	Wyden
Cruz	Markey	
Ernst	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Paul	
Isakson	Sanders	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 16.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, cloture having been invoked on the motion to concur, the other pending motions are withdrawn.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur.

Ms. ERNST. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 428 Leg.]

YEAS—81

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Bennet	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Jones	Scott (SC)
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Sinema
Coons	Lankford	Smith
Cornyn	Leahy	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Sullivan
Cotton	McConnell	Tester
Cramer	McSally	Thune
Crapo	Menendez	Tillis
Daines	Moran	Toomey
Duckworth	Murkowski	Udall
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Enzi	Murray	Whitehouse
Ernst	Perdue	Wicker
Feinstein	Peters	Young

NAYS—11

Braun	Hawley	Schumer
Carper	Lee	Van Hollen
Cruz	Markey	Wyden
Gillibrand	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Sanders
Burr	Klobuchar	Warren
Harris	Paul	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1158

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 81, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1158.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 81) was agreed to.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 1865

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 82, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 82) directing the clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1865.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 82) was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE RUST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is with gratitude that I pay tribute today to Mike Rust, a leading advocate for positive healthcare outcomes in Kentucky. With a long list of accomplishments and two dozen years as president of the Kentucky Hospital Association, Mike has certainly earned a relaxing and enjoyable retirement. Communities throughout our Commonwealth have benefited from Mike's leadership, and I would like to join them today in honoring his impressive career.

Before coming to Kentucky, Mike worked in senior positions at hospitals

in West Virginia and with the Florida Hospital Association. Taking the impressive skills he developed throughout his career, Mike joined the KHA in 1996 as its third president. Mike and his team support the work of each and every one of Kentucky's 120-plus hospitals to enhance healthcare services in both rural and urban communities across the Commonwealth.

In addition to its advocacy work, the KHA under Mike's leadership offers critical services to its membership, including research, education, and support for patient safety and quality care. Patients and hospitals in our State will continue to benefit from Mike's great work for many years to come. Through his achievements on behalf of Kentucky's hospitals and their patients, Mike has earned the respect of his peers in our Commonwealth and across the Nation.

On a personal note, I have enjoyed partnering with Mike in my work in the Senate to support Kentucky families and communities. Just recently, the KHA supported my effort to raise the nationwide minimum purchase age for tobacco products from 18 to 21. His counsel was also particularly beneficial in our fight against the passage of Obamacare, which the KHA rightly opposed. My staff and I will miss Mike's collaboration on many important Kentucky priorities, but I am confident the organization he dedicated so much of his life to will continue building upon his legacy.

As Mike reaches this milestone, I would like to thank him for his leadership on behalf of hospitals and families across the Commonwealth. I share my best wishes with Mike and his family for many years of relaxation and enjoyment together. Finally, I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in congratulating Mike Rust for a long career of distinguished advocacy and service to Kentucky.

TRIBUTE TO COACH SCOTT SATTERFIELD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it was a year ago this month that my alma mater, the University of Louisville, hired Scott Satterfield as its new football coach. The Cardinals convinced Scott to leave his head coaching job at Appalachian State University and take over Louisville's program. Today, it is a real pleasure for me to celebrate the good decision he made and to congratulate Coach Scott Satterfield for earning the title of "2019 Atlantic Coast Conference Football Coach of the Year."

When he first walked into Louisville's locker room as head coach, Scott faced a daunting task. The Cardinals ended their previous season with only two wins, leaving the team disappointed and the fans less than enthusiastic. Critics predicted another lackluster year for the Cardinals, and a pre-season poll anticipated a repeat last-place finish in the division.

Well, anyone who made those predictions clearly didn't know Scott. They didn't understand the effect he could have on UofL's program and its student-athletes in hardly any time at all. Now, 1 year into the Satterfield-era, the University of Louisville Cardinals have won seven games, placed second in their division, and the team is on the way to the Music City Bowl. And when they take the field in Nashville, the Cardinals will be led by their award-winning and expectations-beating head coach.

It is a great privilege for a longtime Cards fan like myself to pay tribute to Coach Satterfield and his many accomplishments. He set out to change the program's culture, to restore the team's confidence, and to unite the players, coaches, and fans together around a shared purpose. Overcoming a challenging schedule took vision and grit, which are qualities Scott possesses in great measure.

Coach Satterfield has made fall Saturdays—or should I say “Satterdays”—in Louisville a whole lot of fun. Igniting an explosive offense, including 2019 All-ACC first team honorees Tutu Atwell and Mekhi Becton, the Cardinals averaged more than 440 yards per game. The defense stepped up too—often when it mattered most—and helped add a couple of quality wins to the Cardinals' resume.

Scott began this season determined to prove that this team could live up to its greatest potential. Along with Louisville's other top-notch coaches, he is helping to restore UofL's pride. And after only a single season, he is already making history. As the first UofL coach to ever be named “ACC Coach of the Year,” Scott has shown that he not only has what it takes to compete at the highest levels of college football but that he is also ready to lead his team, our university, and the city to victory.

So I would like to congratulate Coach Scott Satterfield for receiving this well-deserved honor and to thank him for providing some extraordinary football to watch this season. I hope my Senate colleagues will join me in paying tribute to Scott as he prepares to finish strong in Nashville at the end of the month. I for one, look forward to cheering on my Cards.

TRIBUTE TO NICOLAAS BUDDE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a longtime member of my staff, Nicolaas Budde, who is departing my office after 15 years of service.

Nic has been my systems administrator, responsible for keeping all of the technology in my personal and leadership Senate offices here in Washington and in our three State offices in good working order, among many other things.

Needless to say, a key part of the job description for a systems administrator is the ability to be extremely

patient with those of us who may not be as up to speed on the technology available to us. And I would say that there are very few people who are as patient and kind as Nic.

From fixing a recalcitrant printer to setting up a new, high-tech studio for the Senate Republican conference, Nic always does what can often be frustrating and time-consuming work with a cheerful smile and a reassuring word. He comes to work every single day with a sunny and enthusiastic attitude, and he doesn't accept anything less than the best when it comes to serving South Dakotans and our fellow Americans.

Nic grew up in Harrisburg, SD, and worked on both of my Senate campaigns as systems administrator while he was in college at Dakota State University in Madison, SD. For those who may not know, Dakota State University is the “high-tech” college in our State, and students who graduate from DSU often go on to prestigious jobs at technology companies and the like. Nic could have done any of those jobs, but instead he chose to dedicate his career to serving here in the Senate.

Nic is very involved in the Senate community, often vetting new technologies and participating in pilot projects and working groups regarding the use of technology in the Senate. Nic manages my official website, and during his tenure the site has earned several Mouse Awards from the non-partisan Congressional Management Foundation, including a Gold Mouse Award. Our website is a critical part of our efforts to keep constituents informed about the work we do on their behalf, and I am grateful to Nic for all the work he has done to make our site a helpful resource for South Dakotans.

Before I came to my current leadership position as majority whip, I was head of the Senate Republican Conference, and Nic was a key part of the conference team. While we were there, Nic managed a complex and highly technical project to upgrade the technological infrastructure of the office, an important but often unsung part of our ability to get our conference's message out to the nation.

Nic is currently managing a similarly difficult project at the Senate Republican Conference, setting up a new, high-tech studio that will greatly expand our technological and communications capabilities in that office. This is incredibly important work, and Nic has done all of this while at the same time putting out fires in my whip office and in the personal office whenever the phones go down or someone's email isn't working—and always with a smile and a great deal of patience.

I want to thank Nic for his service and also thank his wife Jackie and his children, Ella and Frederick, for letting us have their husband and dad for these many years.

Thankfully, Nic won't be going far. He will just be down the hall continuing his work at the Senate Repub-

lican Conference, where all of my colleagues will get the benefit of his expertise.

Nic, thank you again for your many years of service, your cheerfulness, your kindness, your hard work, and most importantly, your patience.

We wish you the very best for the future.

RECOGNIZING WGN-TV

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we find ourselves in the usual December doldrums. We are somewhere between the end of the baseball season and the beginning of spring training. It is a time to reflect and a time to dream.

A familiar offseason refrain from many die-hard Chicago Cubs fans is, “Wait ‘til next year” or “next season will be different.” Well, next season will indeed be different as Cubs fans will not, in the immortal words of Steve Goodman, be able to “catch it all on WGN.” Chicago Cubs baseball is moving to the new Marquee Sports Network. I want to take a moment to honor WGN's long-standing commitment to unsurpassed sports coverage and their historic partnership with the Cubs.

I think it is safe to say that, for the most part, Cubs fans are an optimistic bunch. We have endured some very tough seasons and the longest championship drought in Major League Baseball. Of course, in 2016, the Cubs rewarded their fans with a World Series championship, the first in more than a century. Throughout much of that century, fans could count on watching their favorite team on “Chicago's Very Own,” WGN-TV. In fact, for 72 years, WGN helped spread the thrills of Cubs baseball through player milestones, including Mr. Cub Ernie Banks' 500th homerun, pennant races, October baseball, and more than a few lean years.

The Cubs game on April 23, 1948, wasn't a particularly memorable one. They lost 1-0 to the rival St. Louis Cardinals. History was made not on the field but in the broadcast booth as WGN-TV aired its first Cubs game and set in motion the longest baseball-TV relationship in baseball history. Since then, WGN-TV has aired 7,115 Cubs games, reaching fans across the country and around the globe.

It was a great risk for the Cubs to start airing all their games on television. What if people stopped going to games and only watched from home? After all, WGN-TV made it feel like you were at the game. The Zoomar lens brought long shots and close-ups into focus as a television cameraman swung quickly from views of the whole diamond to close-ups of batting, pitching, and action in the bullpen. But the gamble was worth it. The Cubs drew 1.2 million fans to Wrigley Field in 1948, despite losing 90 games that season.

It became a tradition for kids to come home after school to watch the Cubs on WGN. Hall of famers Ernie Banks, Billy Williams, Ron Santo,

Fergie Jenkins, Andre Dawson, Ryne Sandberg, and a host of Cubs stars became household names to fans across the country. Many a big leaguer today will tell stories about watching the Cubs on WGN-TV and dreaming of playing at Wrigley Field.

Generations of fans grew up knowing the sights and sounds of WGN-TV's Jack Brickhouse yelling, "Hey-hey!" or Harry Caray's "Holy cow!" and his famous rendition of "Take Me Out to the Ball Game." Both of these hall of famers informed, entertained, and thrilled us for decades with their play-by-play. They dazzled in the booth even when the action on the field fell a bit short. WGN legendary producer/director Arne Harris was behind the scenes from the 1960s through 2001, bringing us baseball history from Wrigley Field. A distinguished list of announcers also graced the WGN-TV broadcast booth including Milo Hamilton, Lou Boudreau, Vince Lloyd, and Lloyd Pettit. Today, Len Kasper and Jim Deshaies faithfully continue that tradition and are our trusted guides to Cubs baseball. They will continue, along with WGN-TV director of production and author Bob Vorwald, on the new network in 2020.

I want to take this opportunity to thank WGN-TV president general manager Paul Rennie and all the good people at WGN who brought us the sights and sounds of the Cubs and the Friendly Confines for 72 years.

In addition to those already mentioned, we acknowledge longtime sports editor Jack Rosenberg, who routinely pulled off the impossible in support of the telecast; directors Chris Erskine, Jack Jacobson, Bill Lotzer, Skip Ellison, and Marc Brady; and videographer Joe Pausback. My friend, Shaun Sheehan, was WGN's ambassador to Washington and to the Congress for nearly three decades. And countless assistant directors, technical directors, camera operators, audio engineers, video shaders, and sales, business, and station executives, including Jim Tianis, Frank Leone, Mike Aiello, Scott Jones, Steve Casey, Mike Clay, Mark Stencel, Marty Wilke, Errol Gerber, Marissa Rudman, Jake Fendley, Mark Boe, Jeff Shaw, Ward Quaal, Joe Loughlin, Dennis FitzSimons, Peter Walker, John Vitanovec, Tom Ehlmann, Greg Easterly, Jim Dowdle, Sheldon Cooper, Jim Zerwekh, Bob Ramsey, Tom Boyd, and Terry "Whitey" Pearson truly made Cubs baseball on WGN-TV special.

As Bob Vorwald said just before the final games on WGN, "We want to tip our hat to Jack Brickhouse and Harry Caray and all the people that have announced and the thousands of men and women that have worked on the games. But, the best way to do that is by having a great telecast. That's always

been our mission, and it's important that we uphold that to the very end."

As WGN-TV and all the people who made Chicago Cubs baseball telecasts possible sign off, let me join the countless fans in thanking them for creating an American standard of broadcasting excellence.

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits. In addition, sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

The Senate will soon consider two measures: the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1158, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, and the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1865, the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020. These measures contain spending that qualifies for cap adjustments under current law.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 includes multiple instances of cap adjustment eligible spending. The measure includes \$70,855 million in spending designated as being for overseas contingency operations, OCO, funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of BBEDCA. This budget authority, all of which falls into the revised security category, would result in \$40,336 million in outlays in fiscal year 2020. The measure further includes \$17,503 million in spending designated for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of BBEDCA. This budget authority, all of which falls into the revised nonsecurity category, would result in \$984 million in outlays. The measure also includes \$1,771 million in revised security category budget authority that is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates that this budget authority, as well as other emergency designated changes, would increase net outlays by \$914 million this fiscal year.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020, also includes \$2,500 million in nonsecurity budget authority that is designated as being for the periodic U.S. Census pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(G) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates that this budget authority will result in \$1,800 million in outlays in fiscal year 2020. Earlier this year, I made an adjustment to accommodate funding in this amount for this purpose and reaffirm those funds for use for this measure.

The Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 also includes multiple instances of cap adjustment eligible spending. The measure includes \$8,645 million in spending designated as being for OCO funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of BBEDCA. This budget authority, \$645 million of which falls into the revised security category and \$8,000 million falls into the revised nonsecurity category, would result in \$2,327 million in outlays in fiscal year 2020. The measure includes \$1,842 million in spending designated for program integrity pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(B), section 251(b)(2)(C), and section 251(b)(2)(E) of BBEDCA. This budget authority, all of which falls into the revised nonsecurity category, would result in \$1,481 million in outlays. The measure also includes \$6,764 million in revised nonsecurity category budget authority that is designated as an emergency pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. CBO estimates that this budget authority, as well as other emergency designated changes, would increase net outlays by \$1,705 million this fiscal year.

The Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 also includes \$2,250 million in nonsecurity discretionary budget authority for wildfire suppression operations pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(F) of BBEDCA. This budget authority and its associated outlays of \$2,250 million qualify for an adjustment under the law. Earlier this year, I made an adjustment to accommodate funding in this amount for this purpose and reaffirm those funds for use for this measure. As such, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised nonsecurity budget authority by \$27,880 million, revised security budget authority by \$79,500 million, and general outlays by \$47,747 million in fiscal year 2020. Further, I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2020 by \$107,126 million in budget authority and \$47,534 million in outlays.

I ask unanimous consent that this notice and the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES		
(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)		
	\$ in millions	2020
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,708,996
Outlays		3,685,541
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority		107,126
Outlays		47,534
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,816,122
Outlays		3,733,075

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020
(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions							2020
Current Allocation:							
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority							666,500
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority							626,258
General Purpose Outlays							1,368,429
Adjustments:							
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority							79,500
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority							27,880
General Purpose Outlays							47,747
Revised Allocation:							
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority							746,000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority							654,138
General Purpose Outlays							1,416,176

Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	OCO	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Wildfire Suppression	U.S. Census	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	71,500	0	0	8,000	0	0	79,500
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	8,000	1,842	17,503	535	0	0	27,880
General Purpose Outlays	42,663	1,481	984	2,619	0	0	47,747

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the President's nominees for the Federal bench. I strongly believe that women should be in charge of their own healthcare decisions. Family planning choices are deeply personal, and women should be free to make the choice that is right for them, their family, faith, personal beliefs, or medical needs. As States like Alabama, Georgia, and others attempt to roll back women's access to reproductive healthcare, it is more important than ever that we work together to protect this right.

Unfortunately, too many of President Trump's nominees to the Federal courts hold beliefs that fail to respect long-settled precedent on women's healthcare. For example, the Senate recently voted to confirm Sarah Pitlyk to a Federal district court. As an attorney, she defended Iowa's unconstitutional ban on abortions at 6 weeks. Pitlyk has also worked to defend the Trump administration's Title X gag rule, which prohibits healthcare providers who receive this critical funding from discussing the full range of family planning options with their patients. And finally, she lacked any meaningful trial experience. It is no wonder the American Bar Association found that she was unqualified to serve on the district court.

Despite *Roe v. Wade* being the law of the land, too many of President Trump's nominees have actively sought to undermine the rights of women to control their own reproductive health choices. Their amicus briefs, legal writings, and arguments demonstrate a hostility towards women's rights that are incompatible with the role of a Federal judge.

I will continue to evaluate President Trump's judicial nominees based on their stances on women's reproductive health and remain committed to voting for nominees who have a strong record on upholding constitutionally protected reproductive healthcare rights. Accordingly, had I been present in the Senate, I would have voted against the nominations of Michael Park to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Dan Collins to the U.S.

Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Peter Phipps to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, Wendy Williams Berger to the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Brian Buescher to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska, Michael Liburdi to the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona, Sean Jordan to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Brantley Starr to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Jeffrey Vincent Brown to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas, and William Shaw Stickman IV to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Stephen Menashi to serve on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals and Lawrence VanDyke to serve on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Moving forward, it is my hope that the President will nominate individuals who respect women's healthcare decisions.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, after visiting our southern border countless times, most recently in August when I toured the Mexican side of the border with their deployed National Guard units, I know that we face a dire situation that is only improving because of the aggressive action taken by President Trump. As he and I both know, more needs to be done. Securing our border is vital to national security.

In our discussions with the Mexican Government following my recent trip, they expressed strong support for doing work on their southern border to stem the tide of illegal immigrants from other nations in Central America. Accordingly, I am proud to introduce the Mirador-Calakmul Basin Maya Security & Conservation Partnership Act, which will provide critical resources to the region to supplement the efforts made by the Government of Mexico to secure its own southern border. These resources will be critical because increased insecurity and lack of economic opportunity in this region are drivers of emigration from Guatemala and Mexico to the United States as

local communities face pressure to participate in deforestation, logging, narcotics trafficking and other illicit activities. It is in the best interest for the national security of the United States to support political stability, reduced migration, reduction of poverty, and enhanced economic development around the basin in Guatemala and Mexico.

The Mirador Basin features beautiful Mayan ruins with networks of pyramids, palaces, and ancient cities that many consider to be the eighth wonder of the world, and I would agree. I used to fly my plane over the Mirador Basin, and I have seen the magnificent structures with my own eyes. My legislation will support efforts made by the Department of the Interior, the Department of State, the Mexican Government the Guatemalan Government and various universities and research institutions to secure this region and ensure future generations are afforded the same opportunity to see these magnificent Mayan ruins.

One of the most important things we can do to secure this region is support the local communities surrounding the Mirador Basin by providing economic opportunity and ensuring that this community receives direct economic benefit. If the members of the local community are able to find work in the region, it will greatly reduce the incentive to attempt the arduous journey to illegally immigrate to the United States.

Mr. President, it is critical that we secure our southern border. Border security is national security. It is just that simple. There are many proposals targeting this issue, and I support many of them—including building the wall. This additional legislation is a targeted approach, and I thank Senators UDALL and RISCH for joining me in this initiative.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, on the motion to invoke cloture on the House amendment to the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1158, the Consolidated Appropriations Act, vote No. 427, I had intended to be recorded as voting no.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the Record.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall vote No. 401, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 382, Matthew Walden McFarland, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 402, the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 382, Matthew Walden McFarland, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 403, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 465, Anuraag Singhal, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 404, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 466, Karen Spencer Marston, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 405, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 480, Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 406, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 481, Jodi W. Dishman, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 407, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 490, John M. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 408, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 536, Bernard Maurice Jones II, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted no on rollcall Vote No. 409, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 354, Mary Kay Vyskocil, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall Vote No. 410, the motion to

invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 383, Kea Whetzal Riggs, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

Mr. President. I was absent, but had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall Vote No. 412, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 357, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.●

H.R. 1865

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today the Senate passed H.R. 1865, one of two appropriations packages needed to fund the Federal Government for fiscal year 2020.

Eight appropriations bills are part of this consolidated appropriations bill—eight bills that fund programs which impact every part of our lives—and I am pleased that we have made several strong steps to better serve the American people.

For Maryland and the Chesapeake Bay, the bill provides a historic level of funding for EPA's Chesapeake Bay program and continued funding for the dredging needs of the Port of Baltimore. In addition, the bill provides funding for the Army Corps of Engineers to resume oyster restoration work in the bay. These are hard-fought wins, and I appreciate the work of those in the Maryland and Chesapeake Bay delegations to help get this done.

After years of Republican opposition, this bill finally funds critical gun violence research at the Centers for Disease Control. Gun violence is an epidemic, and we should be engaging our best minds to find solutions to keep the American people safe. I am also pleased that the bill includes funding for the CDC to research sexual abuse prevention and for the Agency for Healthcare Research Quality to support diagnostic error research—issues I have worked on in the Appropriations Committee. The bill also includes important increases for medical research at the National Institutes of Health and delivers funding to implement the Childhood Cancer STAR Act.

H.R. 1865 includes a funding increase for the Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health Program, which helps develop, maintain, or enhance infant and early childhood mental health promotion, intervention, and treatment programs for children at risk of developing, showing early signs of, or having been diagnosed with mental illness. The bill also includes funding to continue the National Adoption Competency Mental Health Training Initiative, which helps child welfare and mental health workers better understand and address the mental health needs of children, youth, and their families moving toward or having achieved permanency through adoption or guardianship.

I am also very pleased that the bill continues the Federal funding commit-

ment to WMATA. I, along with Senator CARDIN and our colleagues from Virginia have introduced a WMATA reauthorization bill that would authorize an additional 10 years of Federal funding. WMATA is the Nation's transit system, and maintaining our Federal support is essential for the local economy and for the people who live and work here. Given the significant Federal ridership, it is incumbent on us to ensure the Federal Government pay its fair share.

The bill fully funds a housing mobility demonstration project that Senator YOUNG and I have worked to develop. I look forward to the results of the program as we look to expand housing vouchers and give families a safe and stable place from which to build their futures. The bill also funds the community development block grant and HOME Partnership Program, two crucial economic development programs that were eliminated in the President's budget.

I am pleased that the bill rejected a number of the President's cuts to education and actually boosts funds for afterschool and student support programs. It increases funding for title I and IDEA, two foundational programs that help students in underserved areas and those with disabilities have the resources they need to get a good education. The bill expands access to early education by increasing funds for the child care and development block grant and provides more K-12 wraparound services with boosts to the Full Service Community Schools and Promise Neighborhoods Programs. The bill increases the Pell grant and continues funding for Senators to pay their interns—an initiative I have worked closely on with Senators MURPHY, SCHATZ, COLLINS, and MURKOWSKI.

While the bill is mostly focused on domestic policy, I appreciate the inclusion of language I authored to hold Saudi Arabia to the "gold standard" section 123 agreement as a condition for Export-Import Bank financing for U.S. nuclear exports. We should not be transferring sensitive nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia without the establishment of strong nonproliferation guardrails. I am also pleased that the bill retains my provisions to sanction foreign government officials responsible for the detention of American citizens and locally employed staff of U.S. diplomatic missions, urges the Indian Government to reverse course in Kashmir, bans the sale of arms to Turkish President Erdogan's bodyguards, and mandates comprehensive oversight of the administration's travel ban and refugee resettlement policies. In addition, this legislation provides critical humanitarian and development assistance for our partners and allies around the world, despite President Trump's repeated attempts to cut the foreign assistance budget dramatically.

Importantly, H.R. 1865 includes a 10-year reauthorization of the Patient-

Centered Outcomes Research Institute, PCORI. When PCORI was first created, there was broad agreement about the critical need for comparative effectiveness research, CER. The CER research being done through PCORI is helping to generate more personalized, more reliable research that is directly relevant to individual patients and doctors. There are significant evidence gaps about what medical treatments and services are most clinically effective and for whom. We need more information, and that information must quickly get into the hands of patients and providers so they can make better-informed decisions about their health care. PCORI-funded research is helping to fill that gap, and I am pleased that this bill will allow it to continue for another decade.

The bill also includes important policy improvements contained in the PCORI Reauthorization Act, S. 2897, legislation I introduced with Senators WARNER, CASSIDY, and CAPITO. H.R. 1865 will ensure that PCORI-funded research is designed to take into account and capture the full range of clinical and patient-centered outcomes, including the potential burdens and economic impacts of various medical treatments, items, and services like out-of-pocket costs and nonmedical costs to patients and families. Additionally, it adds a requirement that the Government Accountability Office report on any barriers that researchers funded by PCORI have encountered in conducting studies or clinical trials, including challenges covering the cost of any medical treatments, services, and items.

I am, however, disappointed that this bill eliminates Medicare's contribution to the PCORI Trust Fund. Medicare beneficiaries benefit greatly from PCORI-funded research. This includes a number of projects that have focused on helping older adults and their caregivers make better-informed decisions about their health care options, as well as research on diseases and conditions that disproportionately impact beneficiaries. I am concerned that divesting Medicare dollars sends a signal to PCORI that Congress is not interested in this critical research continuing to be funded. I am pleased that this bill increases the mandatory appropriation to help make up for the loss of Medicare funds, but Congress must maintain this investment over the full length of the authorization.

I am pleased that H.R. 1865 includes a number of other bills that I am proud to cosponsor, including the CREATES Act, the Patient Access to Cellular Transplant Act, and the Protecting Beneficiary Access to Complex Rehabilitation Technology Act.

While I support much of this bill, I am deeply troubled by some of its provisions.

I have serious concerns about parts of the tax extenders provisions of the package. It is unfortunate that following on the heels of a tax cut for wealthy households and big corpora-

tions that increased the national debt by nearly \$2 trillion, the tax changes in this bill increase deficits by a further \$426 billion. While I support some of the changes, we should have paid for them by scaling back wasteful tax breaks for those at the very top. And some of them represent additional giveaways to industry without sufficient benefit for everyday Americans. Moreover, I am extremely disappointed that the tax extenders package did not include tax measures for energy storage, solar energy, offshore wind, and electric vehicles. This represents a lost opportunity to take even small steps to address the climate crisis, and I urge my colleagues to address these clean energy tax measures early next year.

I am disappointed that the bill drops House language preventing the Department of Agriculture from physically relocating the Economic Research Service, ERS, and National Institute of Food & Agriculture, NIFA, outside of the National Capital Region. The relocation and reorganization will impact the quality and breadth of the work these agencies support and perform—work that is critical to informing and supporting U.S. agriculture, food security, and rural development. I appreciate that the bill includes no additional funding for the move, and I hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will with us in Congress to repair the damage that this relocation scheme has done.

While I do have concerns about aspects of this bill, I believe it supports critical health, education, and infrastructure needs. I appreciate the hard work of Senators SHELBY and LEAHY and their staffs in crafting the bill and their support for many priorities I have pushed for on behalf of my constituents in Maryland. It is an honor to serve on the Appropriations Committee, and I look forward to continuing our work to responsibly fund the government and its services for the American people in the coming fiscal year.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

The National Defense Authorization Act conference agreement provides crucial resources to our Armed Forces and our national defense, including a pay increase for our men and women in uniform. I am proud that the Congress was able to come together on a bipartisan basis to pass this legislation to support our servicemembers, strengthen our national security, and invest in critical projects in my home State of Maryland.

While I have serious reservations about a number of items included in this legislation and am particularly disappointed by the exclusion of important priorities like the DETER Act to prevent Russian interference in our elections, I believe that, on balance,

this NDAA will strengthen our national security. For that reason, I voted in favor of it.

With this bill, the Federal Government will now provide 12 weeks of paid parental leave to its workforce. We have been fighting for years to provide paid family and medical leave to workers throughout the country. Now the Federal Government will finally start to lead by example. Paid leave will reduce employee turnover costs for the Federal Government and help agencies continue to recruit and retain top-notch talent into the civil service. I was proud to help secure this, and we need to keep fighting until all workers around the Nation receive paid family and medical leave benefits.

The NDAA also repeals the military widow's tax. Currently, military widows and widowers who qualify for the VA's dependency and indemnity compensation are forced to take a dollar-for-dollar offset from the DOD Survivors Benefits Plan benefit, even though their retired spouses elected to pay into the program. No other Federal surviving spouse is required to forfeit his or her Federal annuity because military service caused his or her sponsor's death. This is fundamentally unjust. In September, I met with a constituent and military widow who was subjected to this offset after the loss of her husband. Hearing her story hardened my resolve to ensure that we got this done this year, and I am proud of the Congress for coming together to repeal this offset.

Critically, this legislation also includes the Otto Warmbier North Korea Nuclear Sanctions and Enforcement Act, which I introduced with Senator TOOMEY. This legislation offers foreign banks and firms a stark choice: continue business with North Korea or maintain access to the U.S. financial system. Within 120 days of enactment of the law, this legislation mandates sanctions on the foreign banks and companies that facilitate illicit financial transactions for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. North Korea continues to perfect its ballistic missile capabilities and produce more fissile material for nuclear weapons. Our aim is to cut off North Korea's remaining access to the international financial system and create the leverage necessary for serious nuclear negotiations to achieve the goal of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

The NDAA also includes bipartisan legislation that tracks the provision Senator GRAHAM and I included in Senate Foreign Operations appropriations bills over the years to prohibit the transfer of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter to Turkey until President Erdogan relinquishes the Russian S-400 air and missile defense system. Turkey has recently started testing the S-400 missile system, and they have said the system will be operational early next year. The administration must not only continue blocking the transfer of the F-

35s, but—as Senator GRAHAM and I indicated in a recent letter to Secretary Pompeo—it has a legal duty to impose economic sanctions on Turkey.

The NDAA also includes a version of a bill Senator COTTON and I introduced to prevent the President from removing Chinese telecommunications giant Huawei from the Commerce Department's Entity List without certifying to Congress that it is complying with U.S. laws and the administration has mitigated the threat Huawei poses to our national security. While I was disappointed that our original bill was watered down, the final version is still better than the status quo.

This bill also includes a number of measures I introduced to ensure that we give proper recognition to Americans who have bravely served our country in combat. One of them is Col. Charles McGee. Colonel McGee, a distinguished Tuskegee Airman who recently celebrated his 100th birthday, is a living aviation legend and an American hero. From World War II to Korea, Colonel McGee flew more combat missions than any other pilot in the service of his country. The first African American to command a stateside Air Force wing and base, this Marylander's service to our Nation is truly remarkable. That is why I worked with the Air Force and introduced legislation to authorize the honorary promotion of Colonel McGee to brigadier general. And today, on a bipartisan basis, the Congress has authorized this honor. Colonel McGee makes all Marylanders proud and reminds us all of what it means to serve.

The conference report also includes the bipartisan World War I Valor Medals Review Act, which I introduced with Senator BLUNT. This legislation directs the Department of Defense to review the service records of minority service members who fought during World War I and who may have been passed over for the Medal of Honor because of their race or ethnicity. Many of these individuals have never received proper recognition for their acts of valor.

Take, for example, William Butler of Salisbury, MD. In 1916 he was living in Harlem, where he enlisted in the New York National Guard. His regiment landed in France on Jan. 1, 1918. Sergeant Butler received the Distinguished Service Cross and the French Croix de Guerre for his bravery in rescuing several members of his regiment from their German captors. Sergeant Butler killed 10 Germans, took a German prisoner, freed all the American prisoners, and brought them back to safety. He returned home to a hero's welcome. The Baltimore Afro-American called him "Maryland's Greatest Hero." The New York Tribune called him a "hero among heroes." He and the rest of the Harlem Hellfighters marched through New York City. Upon his return to Maryland, his small community gave him a gold watch as a token of their respect and appreciation. But despite a

recommendation for the Medal of Honor, he never received it. In 1947, after losing the ability to work, he took his own life. He was buried at Arlington—with a typo on his tombstone.

The living descendants of these veterans deserve to know that their government, despite its past failings, recognizes their heroism. I am very proud of the Congress for coming together to honor those who chose to serve their country, even at a time when their country did not treat them as equal citizens. In doing so we demonstrate that it is never too late to right a historical wrong.

I would also like to commend the Valor Medals Review Task Force, jointly established by the United States Foundation for the Commemoration of the World Wars and the George S. Robb Centre for the Study of the Great War, which has worked tirelessly to identify World War I veteran service records for this review. I applaud the NDAA conferees for encouraging the Secretaries of the military departments to consult with the Valor Medals Review Task Force to identify those service records that warrant further review to determine whether such veteran should be recommended for an upgrade to the Medal of Honor for valor.

The NDAA also addresses serious concerns with the oversight of privatized military housing. Over the past year, I have engaged with leaders at Fort Meade and Aberdeen Proving Ground as they have addressed woefully inadequate maintenance by private housing contractors. The NDAA includes key provisions of the Ensuring Safe Housing for Our Military Act, of which I am a cosponsor. This includes withholding payment of the basic allowance for housing under certain circumstances, the creation of a Tenant Bill of Rights and the position of Chief Housing Officer, a uniform code of basic standards for privatized military housing, and access for tenants to an online work order system, among other improvements.

Lastly, I am pleased that the bill includes language requiring congressional notification and a 120-day waiting period before the President gives notice of his intent to withdraw from the New START and Open Skies treaties.

While I am pleased with many of the provisions included in this bill and voted for its passage, I do have significant reservations.

First, the unchecked growth in the defense budget is unsustainable, and the continued use of the overseas contingency operations budget to fund elements of the Pentagon's regular base budget activities with war funds is a blatant abuse of the budget process. We have a duty to ensure the readiness of our forces, and I support efforts to rebuild our Armed Forces after years of costly overseas engagements. But massive spending increases without clear strategic direction do not make us

safer, and the use of off-budget accounts to boost Pentagon spending is a disservice to our children and grandchildren, who will pay for these spending increases regardless of whether or not they are properly accounted for today. Especially in a post-Budget Control Act environment, where we are not constrained by artificial caps, we need to be thoughtful about our spending choices, recognize that every dollar spent on defense is a dollar not spent on health care, education, workforce training, and other critical areas of need. And we need to use OCO in a responsible manner consistent with its original purpose, and not as an off-budget slush fund.

Second, I am extremely disappointed by the Congress's failure to act to prohibit U.S. military support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen. This brutal war has raged for more than 4 years. Thousands have lost their lives in this conflict. Millions are displaced from their homes. The cycle of desperation, destruction, and death continues unabated. Earlier this year, Congress voted to end U.S. support for the war in Yemen—legislation that President Trump vetoed. The refusal of Republicans to address this issue as part of the NDAA is shameful.

Third, this legislation supports the President's effort to spend \$1.3 trillion dollars on nuclear weapons. It contains no prohibition on fielding low-yield nuclear warheads on submarine-launched ballistic missiles, near-full funding for research and development on INF-range missiles, near-full funding to build new ICBMs and associated warheads, and full funding to retain the B83 megaton gravity bomb, which the Obama administration had intended to retire as part of its modernization efforts. And while it affirms the benefits of legally-binding verifiable limits on Russian strategic nuclear forces, it does not explicitly endorse the extension of New START. This, like so much else in this bill, is a missed opportunity. Senator YOUNG and I have introduced bipartisan legislation urging a 5 year extension of the New START agreement, and the Senate should pass it expeditiously.

Fourth, Republicans blocked a provision in the House NDAA that prevented the President from waging a war with Iran without an explicit authorization from the Congress. President Trump's Iran strategy has been blind unilateral escalation with no end goal. That is why his actions have produced exactly the opposite result of what his so-called "maximum pressure" campaign intended. President Trump has dismembered the multilateral coalition that forged the Iran deal. He has frayed our alliances in Europe and empowered our adversaries. All the while, the administration has raised the specter of a possible military intervention with Iran. By blocking this provision, Republicans are enabling the President to subvert Congress's constitutional prerogative with respect to decisions of war.

Finally, Majority Leader McCONNELL blocked the inclusion the bipartisan DETER Act, which I introduced with Senator RUBIO to deter future Russian interference in U.S. Federal elections. The DETER Act sends a clear message to Russian President Putin or any other foreign adversary: If you attack American elections, you will face severe consequences. Leader McCONNELL blocked this measure from the NDAA, even though the Senate unanimously passed a resolution in the fall instructing the NDAA conferees to support its inclusion. In addition, Republican leadership removed a related provision in the House-passed NDAA imposing sanctions on Russian sovereign debt in response to interference in U.S. elections.

Leader McCONNELL's decision to block the DETER Act and the House sanctions on Russian sovereign debt effectively green-lights Russian interference in future U.S. elections. It is a gift to Russian President Vladimir Putin and a subversion of the clear desire expressed by both Chambers of Congress to hold Russia accountable for future interference. It reinforces Putin's belief that the costs of attacking our democracy are low and the rewards are great. It is a dereliction of his duty, as a representative of the people, to protect our Nation from foreign adversaries. I will continue fighting for the passage of the DETER Act. The next national election is less than a year away, and we must make clear to Putin that Russia will pay a steep price if they interfere in another election.

While I am strongly opposed to some of the provisions in this bill and disappointed by the omission of others, I believe that, on balance, the NDAA will strengthen our national security and advance other important national priorities. For that reason, I voted in support of final passage.

TRIBUTE TO JOHNNY ISAKSON

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON from the great State of Georgia. I, like all of my colleagues in the Senate, am saddened by his retirement. His departure leaves a big hole in this Chamber that may never be truly filled.

JOHNNY is a Senator's Senator. He embodies the best qualities of a public servant. He is smart, hard-working, determined, effective. He is humble, not at all self-important, and never seeks attention for himself. He has integrity. He is a man of his word.

He is known throughout the Senate as ready to reach across the aisle to seek bipartisan solutions—one of the main reasons he is so effective. As he put it during his farewell speech on the Senate floor, "I tell you, I am big on bipartisanship." JOHNNY encourages us to take his lead and listen to and work with the other side. We all can learn from his example.

JOHNNY is kind. His heart is big. He always has a smile or greeting for the

Senate custodians, Capitol police, cafeteria workers, Senate pages. He always has the time to be kind to others.

JOHNNY is Georgian through and through and loves his State and its people. He has served them for 45 years—in both State houses and both Congressional Chambers—and is now Georgia's most senior elected official. JOHNNY is as beloved by the people of his State as he is in the Senate—and for good reason. He has worked to build Georgia's economy, its rural communities, its international trade, its harbors, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta, and on and on.

But JOHNNY is not only a champion for his State, he is a champion for the Nation, and he gets things done for our country. JOHNNY's legislative fingerprints are everywhere. From protecting workers' pensions, to fighting childhood hunger, to increasing affordable housing so families have a roof over their heads, to helping people with disabilities, to making sure children with rare diseases get their medications, to getting treatment for victims of the opioid crisis—JOHNNY has been working for the American people because he cares deeply and genuinely about humanity. It is not show for JOHNNY. You see what you get. He is the real deal.

It is important to thank JOHNNY for his extraordinary work on behalf of veterans. He is a veteran himself, having served 6 years in the Georgia Air National Guard after college, and veterans have no stronger champion than JOHNNY. As chair of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, he shepherded an amazing 57 bills through the Senate. He helped extend the GI bill so that veterans aren't met with an arbitrary cutoff to take advantage of their educational benefits. He made sure veterans have access to community- and home-based health services. And his signature VA Mission legislation ensures that healthcare for veterans is more responsive and more effective.

As I said, JOHNNY's heart is big, and he welcomes all people. Atlanta hosted the 1996 summer Olympics. Cobb County is a suburban county of Atlanta and was set to host some preliminary Olympic events. But the Cobb County Commission had passed an anti-gay, discriminatory resolution. At that time, JOHNNY was a Cobb County Republican, serving in the State senate. It might not have been the most popular position in his county, but he urged the County Commission to rescind the resolution.

One of JOHNNY's best friends is civil rights icon JOHN LEWIS. On February 25, 1996, Representative LEWIS introduced JOHNNY as the newest member of Georgia's congressional delegation, and on November 19, 2019, he gave JOHNNY a warm farewell, explaining to the House that "when JOHNNY served in the House of Representatives, we always found a way to come together, and we continued that tradition when he was elected to the Senate. . . . We always found a

way to get along and to do the good work the people deserved. Time and time again, he stood with us, he worked with us to uplift African Americans in the State of Georgia, to recognize individuals like Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and Jackie Robinson, natives of Georgia." At the end of the tribute, Representative LEWIS called JOHNNY his "brother," and they gave each other a long embrace.

During his farewell speech, JOHNNY said:

We still have some people in the United States of America who will play the hate card. We have some politicians who will dance around the issue of hate. They will not use the buzz words, but they will get awful close to it. They did it in Charlottesville. . . . We have to stand up to the evils of society today. If we don't do it, nobody will.

JOHNNY has stood up for over four decades for what he believes in. We will miss his honesty, his integrity, and his fine character. Jill and I wish JOHNNY and Dianne, their three children, and eight grandchildren the very best. Enjoy life. And we will do our best to follow your example in the Senate.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wanted to spend a few moments to recognize my colleague and friend, Senator ISAKSON from Georgia.

When I first came to the Senate in 2009—a decade ago, it surprises me to say—I was on the Banking Committee. We were in the middle of the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression, and millions of Americans were losing their homes each month.

We held a hearing on housing, and I remember Senator ISAKSON coming to testify because, before he was in politics, he had spent several years in the private sector working in real estate. I appreciated that moment because, one, I had also spent some time in business before politics, and two, because it was so refreshing to hear from someone who actually knew what they were talking about.

Over the past 10 years, I have had the benefit of Senator ISAKSON's experience, friendship, and wisdom on both the HELP and Finance Committees.

In JOHNNY, so many of us have had a model for how to get things done even in this moment of partisan division. He was a welcome throwback to a time when people didn't come to this town just to spend every moment on cable news but to get things done for the people they came here to represent.

JOHNNY's record suggests there is nothing quaint or naïve about that approach to the work because over his 15 years in the Senate, he has managed to secure quite a few bipartisan accomplishments, including several things we have worked on together.

I remember JOHNNY really digging in and getting his hands dirty on the SAVE Act, our bill to make Federal mortgage loan agencies consider the returns from energy efficiency when they determine your ability to make your monthly payments. We passed that out of the Senate, and it was a

tremendous credit to JOHNNY's determination and focus.

We passed a bill to modernize the FDA's medical device inspections and to strengthen patient access to rehabilitation hospitals in Colorado and Georgia. We passed an amendment to strengthen funding for early learning programs. And we introduced bills together to provide tax relief for AmeriCorps members who earned Segal Awards to help pay for college.

I could go on, and it is a credit to JOHNNY's broad record of bipartisan work.

JOHNNY has been a particular champion for our veterans. As a former member of the Georgia Air National Guard, JOHNNY has been a steady and effective advocate for those who have served. Last year, he was instrumental in passing a bipartisan bill to make it far easier for veterans to take their benefits to private doctors for care, among other long-overdue reforms. With our large population of veterans in Colorado, we were especially grateful to JOHNNY for his leadership.

There is a lot more I could share, but the point is, JOHNNY has used his time here well—with real results for the people of Georgia. He didn't do it through bullying or shouting or threatening to bring the Senate to its knees if he didn't get his way. He did it JOHNNY's way—with unfailing kindness, grace, humor, and dogged persistence. It would be easy to mistake JOHNNY's kindness for a lack of intensity or determination, but behind his easy smile is a fierce devotion to Georgia and a welcome impatience with the inaction of this town.

That approach is how JOHNNY leaves this body not only with a considerable record of accomplishment but with a long list of admirers on both sides of the aisle who are now wondering who is going to host the annual bipartisan BBQ. We are sad to see him go, and we wish him all the best as he returns to Georgia to focus on his health and spend time with his wife, Diane, their three kids and eight grandkids.

JOHNNY, I wish you the very best. Know that the Senate will feel your absence and cherish the example you set here.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICAN METEOROLOGICAL SOCIETY

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, this month we recognize the 100th anniversary of the founding of the American Meteorological Society, AMS, which spent the last century advancing the atmospheric and related sciences. The work of AMS contributed to technologies and services that expand our understanding of the world and the risks associated with our water, weather, and climate.

AMS was founded in 1919 in Milton, MA, to advance, promote, and disseminate information about these important sciences. The society now has over 13,000 members, including researchers,

educators, students, enthusiasts, broadcasters, and other professionals in weather, water, and climate. Its rigorously peer-reviewed scientific publications and scientific conferences have contributed to knowledge growth across the geosciences, especially in the prediction of environmental phenomena that has led to lifesaving services. AMS also offers nationally recognized certifications that serve the public's need to identify broadcast and consulting meteorologists who have achieved a high level of competency in communicating complex weather, water, and climate information.

AMS has been a leader in promoting diversity, equity, and inclusion in the science, technology, engineering, and math STEM fields. Its activities in support of STEM education and development activities for K-12 teachers have positively impacted millions of students nationwide. Its leadership in education also brings AMS to the Halls of Congress, where the society supports congressional fellows, research studies on environmental policy, and policy briefings to ensure that policies are developed using the best available knowledge and understanding.

AMS has also been crucial in developing the extensive scientific evidence of manmade climate change and has helped us understand the threat it poses to society if we do not act. AMS has been an international leader in providing peer-reviewed information to support evidence-based decision making related to climate change. Congress owes a debt of gratitude to AMS for its advocacy and education on this global threat.

With the scope and size of the challenge that climate change presents, Congress and the American people will undoubtedly depend on another successful century of leadership and scientific advancements from the American Meteorological Society. We congratulate and thank AMS for its century-long effort to understand the natural world, and we pledge our continued support to the important sciences AMS aims to advance.

TRIBUTE TO KAREN J. LEWIS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Karen J. Lewis on her many years of service to Congress. After a 45-year career distinguished by outstanding achievements, Karen will retire from the Congressional Research Service, CRS, in January 2020 after leading the Service's American Law Division, ALD, for many years.

Karen joined CRS as a legislative attorney in 1974 after graduating from Albany Law School earlier that year. In the following decade, Karen provided nonpartisan advice to Congress on some of the most difficult legal matters facing the Nation in the 1970s and 1980s, including sex discrimination in the workplace, abortion rights after *Roe v. Wade*, and the Equal Rights

Amendment. She also advised Congress on the implementation of numerous civil rights laws, including title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Fair Housing Act, title IX of the Higher Education Act, and the Age Discrimination Act.

In 1984, Karen moved into CRS management, serving first as the section head of ALD's consumer law group before heading the Division's administrative law section. In the nearly 25 years she served in these roles, Karen helped mentor dozens of attorneys, engraining in them CRS's core values of providing authoritative and objective legal advice regardless of partisan affiliation. Any attorney trained under Karen's tutelage is well familiar with her repeated advice to rely on primary sources to ensure CRS's legal advice is trustworthy and reliable.

In 2007, Karen was promoted to senior CRS leadership, serving in a variety of capacities, including 11 years as the Assistant Director of CRS's ALD. As the head of the law division, Karen played a central role reviewing ALD's written work, helping to ensure its accuracy, completeness, and quality. She also led countless initiatives for the Service. This included helping to establish the Legal Sidebar—CRS's first exclusively web-based product line to provide succinct and timely analysis to Congress on matters of pressing importance. She also was instrumental in raising the profile of the Service's Federal Law Update, a seminar series that provides continued legal education for Congress, which tripled its average attendance under Karen's leadership. Karen also spearheaded the first major revision since 1952 of the "Constitution Annotated," the Congress' official treatise of record on the Constitution. And Karen has been instrumental in hiring some of the finest attorneys in the Federal Government to help Congress in legal debates over executive power, health care reform, immigration, and the future of the Supreme Court. Moreover, throughout her time in management, Karen served on countless advisory panels that have helped establish organizational practices and policies for CRS.

While Karen's retirement is a loss for Congress, her imprint on the legislative branch will not soon disappear. CRS and the ALD offer an invaluable service to Congress by providing members with reliable, nonpartisan information to assist the legislative process at every step. Karen spent nearly all of her professional career supporting Congress's work and strengthening CRS through her work in ALD. She served as a role model for hundreds of attorneys who can attest that her integrity, work ethic, and dedication to CRS's core values is second to none. Her legacy will continue with the division she helped build and the Service more broadly. Congratulations to Karen, and I wish her many long and happy years in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO NATHAN
BERGERBEST

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a long-time Senate staffer who recently retired, Nathan Bergerbest.

Many Members and staff who have worked on judiciary, military and veterans, homeland security, public safety, foreign relations, intelligence, or Native American issues and national and international disasters likely had the opportunity to work with Nathan during the 16 years he served the people of Alaska and the Nation. I am sure that many can share stories of the help Nathan offered, ideas he pushed to fruition, and wise counsel he provided. My statement today will offer just a slice of the many contributions this accomplished man has made in the lives of so many.

Nathan began his interest in good public policy and politics at a young age growing up in New York City. I believe he once said that he got involved in his first political campaign in elementary school because he was searching for the candidate who could improve his neighborhood. His quest for what was right, what was fair, and what was useful public policy has never subsided.

An attorney, Nathan has been a litigator, represented an Alaska Native regional corporation, and worked at FEMA. He started in my office in 2003 as legislative assistant and retired as senior counsel and deputy chief of staff. Throughout his service here in the Senate, Nathan was the quintessential Senate staffer—working late, knowing his subject cold, understanding the ways of the Senate and navigating them brilliantly.

His portfolio was huge, complex, and important. Yet he never shirked from pitching in where he could be useful. Nathan served not only as a mentor to young staffers in my office but as the conscience of Federal agency employees, military personnel, and elected leaders—constantly challenging us to do better, to be better versions of ourselves.

While a tribute from a former employer is always gratifying, Nathan made a lasting impression on so many who have worked here in the Senate over the years. I would like to share some of their stories. Several of the military fellows who have served in my office and worked closely with Nathan shared these words:

Nathan was part of the original group that came to be known as the Fairbanks Tiger Team, leading the red-shirted charge with the Fairbanks community against the Air Force's proposed plan to remove the F-16 Aggressor Squadron from Eielson Air Force Base. He rallied community leaders, helped leverage the effort on the Defense Appropriations Committee, and ultimately helped the Alaska delegation save Eielson. Then, only a year later, he worked to support the Alaska delegation's strong push to bring the F-35 to Eielson. In just over a year, the delegation was able to take Eielson from a near-shutted installation, to one that will soon have

the most capable fighter aircraft in the world, with significant infrastructure investment to support it.

The Tiger Team still meets over telephone or in person every other Friday to discuss housing and other local community issues related to the military. The team has evolved over the years with new members joining and old members retiring or moving to different lines of work. Nathan will be missed on these calls but his legacy will be forever forged in the Fairbanks community and the national defense of our country.

New commanders coming to Washington, DC, for their Hill visits would often ask my military and veterans affairs liaison in Anchorage for advice about how to prepare. The advice they received was "Don't try to BS Nathan, because he'll be able to sniff it out." Several of these commanders were relieved when the meeting with Nathan was over.

But Nathan would bend over backwards to help the military or a service-member. "A Colonel who served in Alaska attributed Nathan for saving his career. He didn't give any details. Only that he owed him everything." That is just like Nathan—to do good for an American and move on to the next task.

Nathan was a true friend to the Alaska National Guard as well, very close to the Adjutant Generals, and always quick to help support their needs or tout their accomplishments.

Nathan was extremely proud that Alaska boasts the highest rate of veterans per capita and worked to ensure strong representation of the Total Force military and veteran communities, always working to advance veterans' rights and benefits. His efforts helped lead to improvements in VA hospitals in Alaska as well as advances in telemedicine and other support to veterans in remote Alaskan communities.

Public safety and support for law enforcement were always priorities for Nathan. He helped to lead collaborative efforts among the Federal agencies and State and local law enforcement to keep drugs out of Alaskan communities, and he never missed honoring the fallen at the National Fallen Officers Memorial ceremonies. He cared deeply for all those who put themselves in harm's way.

While he was a policy expert in so many areas, Nathan was never one to ignore a plea for help from an individual Alaskan. There are countless examples of "casework" that he took on in addition to his legislative duties. From arranging military honors for veterans' funerals, persuading the Canadian Border Security Agency to reinstate 24-hour border crossings between Hyder, AK, and British Columbia, ensuring Alaskans' concerns were heard by the Navy prior to Northern Edge exercises, protecting National Guard members from retaliation during an investigation of sexual misconduct complaints, improving the standard of care at VA medical facilities, or any number of efforts, Nathan started with the question "What does the individual need?" and went about getting it done. In many instances, Nathan would help

my staff in Alaska navigate the bureaucracy to help solve an Alaskan's problem.

A former attorney for FEMA, Nathan was also the Alaska delegation's go-to staffer whenever disaster struck. After the November 2018 earthquake struck Anchorage, Mat-Su, and the Kenai Peninsula, Nathan helped disentangle municipalities, school districts, business owners, and individuals from the byzantine red tape that often characterizes FEMA. In call after call, Nathan translated FEMA's language and policies for Alaskans and worked with FEMA officials to do a better job assessing and responding to the damage. When FEMA sought to respond to a flood in Galena but lacked a sense of the challenges of rural Alaska, Nathan helped prod and guide the agency in improving the response.

Nathan took the same sense of dedication to his work on Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian issues. Leading Alaska tribal rights attorney Lloyd Miller called Nathan "one of the most knowledgeable and talented lawyers to ever work on the Hill. He combined an unmatched mastery of Alaska Native legal history with a deep sensitivity to Alaska Native issues gained from working inside one of the major Alaska Native regional corporations. And while his background before coming to the Hill was predominantly with Alaska Native corporations, he was equally knowledgeable about the unique challenges confronting Alaska Native Tribes, and the importance of supporting the critical role that Alaska Tribes play alongside their corporations. Nathan's remarkable intellect and sage advice will be deeply missed."

Over the years, as protestors filled the halls of Capitol Hill and individual offices, Nathan would stay late to talk with those who visited my office. He would sit with them for long periods and talk about how they can best navigate the issues, and how they, as advocates, could best approach offices for meetings and how they can present their issues in such a way that they were truly being heard on both sides of the aisle. On at least one or two occasions, I have seen him go and literally sit on the floor with protestors outside of my office for an hour or two—just listening to what they had to say so that he could ensure I understood the concerns of Americans who are so passionate about the important issues of the day.

No matter what the time of day or day of the week, Nathan made himself available to me, to other members of my staff, and to Alaskans. As my constituent services director in Anchorage put it, "I remember one time in particular in 2011 where he and I each took 12-hour shifts around the clock so we could help Alaskan constituents after the 9.0 magnitude earthquake struck in the Pacific Ocean off the northeast coast of Japan. A massive tsunami was triggered that flooded Japan's coastal

communities and damaged infrastructure. We spent several days in communication with constituents stranded in Japan that were trying to navigate the treacherous environment, communicate with the State Department, and ultimately obtain transportation home. He was also helpful in working with stranded Alaskan constituents after the 2015 severe earthquake in Nepal. He reached out to the lobbyist for Orbitz, since many of the foreign air carriers on their website raised prices drastically when trying to book flights out of Nepal after the earthquake."

There are so many stories illustrative of Nathan's positive influence here in the U.S. Senate and in Alaska.

I thank Nathan Bergerbest for his service to Alaska and the Nation and wish him well.

TRIBUTE TO FAISAL AMIN

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the work of Mr. Faisal Amin, who has been serving for the past 4 months as a detailee on the staff of the U.S. Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

Faisal is a senior attorney for the Budget and Appropriations Law Group at the U.S. Government Accountability Office and joined the staff in September of this year to fill in for a long-time staff member on maternity leave.

Faisal has been heavily involved in the drafting, consideration, and passage of the fiscal year 2020 Interior appropriations bill starting from the first day of his assignment with the subcommittee. In just 4 months, he participated in almost all of the milestones of the appropriations process: a committee markup, floor consideration, and conference negotiations.

He ably represented Vice Chairman LEAHY and me throughout the process, handling the day-to-day responsibilities of overseeing the budgets of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and related agencies and working with other congressional offices, Agency staff, nongovernmental organizations, and other stakeholders to ensure that the priorities of Members of this Chamber on both sides of the aisle were well represented.

Faisal did tremendous work, stepping in to handle complicated policy and budgetary issues in an unusually expedited process. He is smart, pragmatic, thoughtful, and strategic—creating an excellent rapport with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and serving as an optimistic and positive presence on the subcommittee. I am grateful for his time with us, and I know his colleagues on the subcommittee staff—Rachael Taylor, Ryan Hunt and Melissa Zimmerman—feel the same way.

On behalf of Vice Chairman LEAHY and the committee, I also extend our gratitude to the Comptroller General, Mr. Gene Dodaro, and the staff of the U.S. Government Accountability Office

for sharing Faisal with us during this critical time.

Congratulations, Faisal, for a job well done, and thank you for your service to the United States Senate.

TRIBUTE TO GARY HARTZ

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Mr. Gary Hartz, who is retiring from his position at the Indian Health Service with 48 years of distinguished Federal service to the Nation.

Mr. Hartz is especially deserving of this Chamber's recognition because he has spent his entire career on a single and absolutely critical goal—improving access to quality health care for American Indians and Alaska Natives. In his current position, Mr. Hartz serves as the Director of the Office of Environmental Health and Engineering, overseeing the construction, maintenance, and operations of Tribal health facilities, sanitation, and environmental health programs, a position that he has performed for more than two decades after working his way up through ranks of the office. An engineer by trade, Mr. Hartz also served as a member of the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps—retiring with the rank of rear admiral—and served briefly as the agency's Deputy Director. He began his career in the field, working as an engineer on projects in New Mexico and Alaska.

I am fortunate to have had the opportunity to work with Mr. Hartz in my roles as vice chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs and the ranking member of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies. He has worked closely with me and my staff and testified before my committees, and I can say from firsthand experience that he is one of the most knowledgeable, dedicated, and pragmatic public servants at the Indian Health Service, and his wisdom and experience will be deeply missed.

Finally, I want to thank him for all that he has done for my home State of New Mexico. Mr. Hartz has been instrumental in working to improve and replace Tribal health facilities, including working most recently on plans to replace the Service's Albuquerque, Alamo, Pueblo Pintado, and Gallup facilities. While we have more to do, I am tremendously grateful for the work that he has done to improve access to quality health care in Native communities across the State.

On behalf of the Nation, thank you for a job well done, Mr. Hartz. I wish you all the best as you begin your next chapter.

TRIBUTE TO DELIA SCOTT

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize Ms. Delia Scott, who is retiring next month with more than 40 years of distinguished Federal service in the executive and legislative branches of government.

I have been lucky enough to work with Delia twice, both when I served in the House of Representatives and in my current role as ranking member of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

Most recently, Delia has served as the Congressional Liaison Officer at the National Gallery of Art, shaping the Gallery's relationship with members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. I know firsthand that Delia has been an effective advocate for the Gallery, playing an essential role in shepherding its annual appropriations through Congress and securing critical funding increases for operating and infrastructure needs.

Beyond her role with the budget, Delia has made it her goal to connect Members of the House and Senate with the world-class collection at the Gallery so they are invested in its success. My wife, Jill, and I are both grateful to have visited countless times to enjoy and learn about significant paintings, sculpture, photographs, and other works because of Delia's thoughtful invitations. The Gallery won't be the same without her.

For all her impressive work at the Gallery, I also want to recognize her enduring legacy of public service in other positions. Prior to her current position, Delia served as the staff director for the House Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, managing a \$30-plus billion funding bill and working to secure funding for natural resources, environmental protection, and Tribal and cultural programs. She also worked as a professional staff member for the committee and worked for more than two decades at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Delia has devoted her entire career to making sure that Federal agencies and programs—from the arts to environmental protection to foreign assistance—have operated smoothly and received ample funding to benefit the people of this Nation. For that service we should all be grateful.

I congratulate her on a job well done and an outstanding Federal career, and I wish her and her husband, John, the very best as they move on to the next chapter of their lives.

TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER MICHAEL D. CASSADY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay special tribute to Commander Michael D. Cassady, Medical Service Corps, U.S. Navy. Commander Cassady currently serves as the Program Manager, Naval Advanced Medical Development at the Naval Medical Research Center and will be released from Active Duty after almost 35 years of Active military service on March 1, 2019. Commander Cassady is a native of Millersport, OH, and I am pleased to recognize his distinguished career.

Commander Cassady enlisted in the U.S. Navy on May 21, 1985, and after

completing initial training at the Naval Training Center in San Diego, he earned designation as a hospital corpsman third class. In 1991, Cassady graduated from University of Maryland University College and received a commission on June 8, 1993 as an environmental health officer.

From 1993 to 1999, Cassady completed tours at the U.S. Naval Hospital Keflavik in Iceland and Branch Medical Clinic in Iwakuni, Japan, where he increased the overall readiness and health of hospital staff and improved testing of the base drinking water. In 2001, he deployed to Australia in support of Exercise Tandem Thrust 2001 and later deployed to Thailand in support of Exercise Cobra Gold 2002 to improve combat readiness, combined-joint interoperability, and enhance security relationships between the United States, Thailand, and Singaporean forces. He subsequently served as a medical department and safety inspector for the Board of Inspection and Survey, providing direct support to the fleet; and as chief, medical concept and development, Joint Forces Command, where he furthered joint warfighter capabilities and supported U.S. Northern Command response and relief efforts post Hurricane Katrina.

In 2006, he deployed to Iraq in support of combat operations, where he served as the civil affairs public health section lead, Multi-National Division in Baghdad. Upon returning from Iraq, he served as the assistant officer in charge for the Navy Environmental and Preventive Medicine Unit Two. Cassady also deployed as the medical planning officer in Expeditionary Strike Group Two and U.S. Naval Forces Central Command in Bahrain, where he was instrumental in coordinating medical plans, guidance, and response to counter piracy and Marine Corps operations, and health service support to the U.S. FIFTH Fleet. His next two tours of duty were as the Environmental Health Officer at the U.S. Naval Hospital Guantanamo Bay in Cuba and the U.S. Naval Hospital in Naples, Italy. During these tours he provided public health oversight and leadership. Commander Cassady reported to his current and final tour of duty in July 2014 at the Naval Medical Research Center in Silver Spring, where he provides program management, leadership, and key administrative direction.

Commander Cassady has spent the entirety of his adult life and over 15 of his 35 years of naval service deployed or stationed overseas in the defense of the United States. Additionally, he holds a master of science in management from Troy State University, a master of public health degree from the Ohio State University, a master of arts in national security and strategy from the Naval War College in 2007, and a master of science in education from Old Dominion University, which he completed in December of 2011.

Mr. President, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, and Commander

Mike Cassady's family and friends in saluting this distinguished officer's many contributions and sacrifices in defense of our great Nation. It is fitting that the Senate today publicly recognizes his service and wishes him, his wife Rohini, and their children, Rhyann, Kassandra, Briana, and David, health, happiness, and success in the years to come.

Congratulations, Commander Cassady, on completing an exemplary career.

TRIBUTE TO YVETTE LEWIS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Yvette Lewis for her excellent service as part of my team in support of the people of Maryland. Yvette has been our director of external relations and community outreach in my Senate office since I began my service in the Senate. In that capacity, she has organized forums throughout Maryland to provide support to our veterans, our senior citizens, and others. Her signature program was organizing consumer protection forums across our State so we could alert Marylanders to the wide array of schemes and scams designed to cheat consumers out of their hard-earned money. She has been deeply committed to the principle that the health of our entire State depends on the success of all our communities.

I have had the pleasure of knowing Yvette for over a decade and am grateful for all her good works in our State and beyond. She is a longtime resident of Bowie, MD, and has worked for years in public service and civic engagement. She has previously worked as the president of the Voter Empowerment Action Project. Moreover, she has also served on the White House Commission for Presidential Scholars. Additionally, she has an accomplished background in music as an opera singer and music teacher in Baltimore City, Baltimore County, and Montgomery county schools. Yvette is married to Ed Lewis, and they have two children, Shannon and Eric.

Various events have led to a sudden vacancy in the position of the chair of the Maryland Democratic Party. Yvette was the consensus choice as the right person for the job at this moment. While we will miss her on Capitol Hill, I am glad that her enormous talents will also be put to good use in her new role.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING DENISE D'ASCENZO

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Denise D'Ascenzo, the longtime anchor at WFSB Channel 3 Eyewitness News, the CBS station in Hartford, CT. She was a trusted journalist, a devoted mother and wife, and a dear friend. Sadly, Denise passed away suddenly on De-

cember 7, 2019. She will be remembered for her tireless grace, integrity, and humor.

Denise was born Washington, DC, and grew up in Rockville, MD, where she became editor-in-chief of her high school newspaper. She attended Syracuse University, where she got her first break in television at WIXT-TV doing the nightly weather forecast. Also at Syracuse, she met the love of her life and future husband, Wayne. After Syracuse there were stops at television stations in St. Louis and Cleveland, before moving to Connecticut in 1986 to join WFSB.

In Connecticut, she provided special coverage of political conventions, the U.S. visit of Pope John the II, 9/11, the arrest of the DC sniper, and the tragic shootings at Sandy Hook Elementary School. Denise had a passion for health and medical reporting, taking viewers inside operating rooms, cardiac catheterization labs, and neonatal intensive care units, as well as onboard Life Star, the critical care helicopter service. She was a leading voice in raising awareness for conditions such as breast cancer, heart disease, obesity, and preventive healthcare.

During her 33 year career at WFSB, she was honored with 2 Edward R. Murrow Awards, 7 Associated Press Awards, 11 Emmy's, and a national Gabriel Award. She was recognized for her work with a number of charities, including the Muscular Dystrophy Association, Mary's Place, and the Channel 3 Kids Camp. In 2013, Denise was elected to the Silver Circle by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences for her significant contributions to broadcasting. In 2015, she became the first woman to be inducted into the Connecticut Broadcasters Association Hall of Fame.

Connecticut has lost a broadcasting legend. We all also lost a dear friend who came into our homes with dignity and decency to tell them the news of the day. She was deeply dedicated to uncovering and conveying the truth of every story. She was there for almost 30 years to guide us through tragedy and triumph, and we miss her immensely.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our deepest sympathies to Denise's family during this difficult time, particularly to her husband, daughter, and coworkers. May their many wonderful memories of Denise provide them solace and comfort in the days ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO DAN FREEDMAN

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Dan Freedman on the occasion of his retirement. Throughout his impressive 32 years as a correspondent in the Hearst Washington Bureau, Dan set an example of tireless, honest reporting. He undertook the monumental task of covering the Connecticut and New York delegations with rigor and expertise. Even as the media environment grows more

partisan, Dan has remained fair and dedicated to the facts.

Dan has helped build an essential professional foundation for countless reporters, mentoring hundreds of newcomers and interns and holding everyone—including himself—to the highest standards. Regarded with immense respect by his colleagues, he routinely challenged himself in order to set a better example for his team and raise the expectations for outstanding reporting.

In DC, legislators trust Dan to deliver a truthful and balanced story. This integrity is essential for the people of Connecticut who rely on reporters like Dan to inform them about the Nation's Capital with a focus on the stories that matter most to them and their communities. Constituents need to know their voices are being heard, and Dan is there to ask the tough questions and to deliver the most complete and honest reporting possible.

During an over four-decade career in journalism, Dan did it all—everything from dodging bullets in wars and insurrections in Central America to covering eight Supreme Court confirmation hearings and even a stint on the George W. Bush Presidential campaign in 2000. His unfailing commitment to his profession was recognized in 2018, when he won the David Lynch Memorial Award for Regional Reporting. Dan's outstanding record of thoughtful, honest, and determined reporting sets a model and demonstrates the critical role of reporters in keeping people throughout the country well informed.

I applaud his lifetime of dogged devotion to bringing the truth to light through fair, fact-filled pieces, and I know my colleagues will join me in thanking Dan for his extraordinary contributions to regional reporting.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT GREENSTEIN

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Robert Greenstein, founder and president of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, for his work over nearly four decades, fighting for a more just and equal society.

Bob founded CBPP in 1981 to push for policies that expand opportunity for the lowest income children and families, and ensure that this country's prosperity is shared with the workers who create it, not just the wealthiest CEOs and the largest corporations. He built CBPP from the ground up and transformed it from a tiny organization with a shoestring budget to one of the most influential policy shapers in the country.

Under Bob's leadership, CBPP combined in-depth analysis and research with clear-headed strategy to drive the debate and deliver results. We worked together to spearhead efforts to permanently expand the earned income tax credit and child tax credit in 2015, and Bob was vital to our success. It is probably the most important thing we have done to life people out of poverty in the

last 25 years, and it could not have happened without Bob's leadership on this issue, stretching back decades.

Of course it is not only tax credits; from passing the Affordable Care Act to strengthening SNAP, from protecting and expanding Medicaid, to fighting for more affordable housing, Bob's work at CBPP has meant that millions of ordinary Americans have more food on the table, more money in their pockets, and a little more economic security. Over his career he has touched so many lives, and he has so much to be proud of.

We know we have a lot more work to do, and while Bob has earned his retirement, I have faith that he will continue to be a force for the progressive change that our country needs.●

TRIBUTE TO CHARLOTTE KINNOMAN

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Charlotte Kinnoman of Lake County for her dedication to Montana's first responders during Christmas.

When Charlotte met a law enforcement officer at an event with her family, she learned of the sacrifices our first responders make to protect Montana's families and communities.

After that meeting, and at just 12 years old, Charlotte decided she wanted to give back to our first responders. She has been writing 125 Christmas cards a day to give to every first responder she meets. She even has a goal of writing 12,000 total. Charlotte's mom and classmates have also been helpful in writing Christmas cards to make sure they are spreading holiday cheer all across Big Sky Country.

I commend Charlotte for her compassion. Charlotte is a great role model for all young Montanans, and I thank her for supporting our first responders this Christmas season.●

TRIBUTE TO WERNER GELLERT

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, Werner Gellert survived the Holocaust and never forgot that terrible injustice. Werner went on to found a museum in Albuquerque dedicated not only to educating people about the Holocaust but dedicated to stopping intolerance wherever it is found.

Werner Gellert was born on June 14, 1926 in Breslau, Germany. During November 9 and 10, 1938, Nazi paramilitary forces carried out a pogrom throughout Germany demolishing and ransacking Jewish homes, businesses, synagogues, schools, and hospitals. At that time, 267 synagogues in Germany and surrounding areas and 7,000 Jewish businesses were destroyed and over 30,000 Jewish men were arrested and incarcerated in concentration camps. That pogrom was called Night of the Broken Glass, or Kristallnacht, meaning "Crystal Night," because of all the broken glass scattered throughout the streets from the shattered windows of Jewish buildings.

After the Night of the Broken Glass, Werner and his adopted parents fled Germany for Shanghai, one of the only places in the world at that time that accepted Jews unconditionally. However, the Japanese who were occupying Shanghai became allied with the Germans, and, on February 18, 1943, they issued a proclamation establishing a restricted area where "stateless refugees" must live and work. Werner and his family were relocated to this restricted area, Hongkew, which became plagued with disease and starvation. On one of his birthdays, Werner asked only for a loaf of bread and jar of jam for himself, but he didn't get his wish. During this period, he suffered through starvation, typhus, yellow fever, and hepatitis, and he was brutalized by a bully and permanently lost most of the sight in one of his eyes.

After the end of World War II, Werner remained in Shanghai, working as a typewriter repairman for the U.S. Army. The Army recognized his intelligence and linguistic skills—he spoke seven languages—and recruited him into Army intelligence as a civilian consultant. He worked undercover for the United States in China, Tibet, and the Philippines.

The Chinese Cultural Revolution of the late 1960s and early 1970s drove out Werner and his family, and they fortunately were able to escape on the last boat out of Shanghai to the United States. They relocated to Denver, where Werner attended Denver University and met his future wife, Frances Silverman—known as "Frankie"—to whom he was married for 54 years, until her passing in 2007.

After a successful career in the savings and loan business in California, Werner and Frankie retired to Albuquerque. Werner fervently believed that education was the most effective weapon against hate and intolerance. With that guiding principal in mind, in 2001, he and Frankie founded the Albuquerque Holocaust and Intolerance Museum.

The museum is dedicated to educating the public through its exhibitions on the horrors and injustices of hate—from the Holocaust, to the African-American experience here in the United States to genocide of minority peoples around the world. Its goal is to promote "upstanders," not bystanders: people who speak out and act to support individuals, groups, or causes attacked or bullied. The museum is home to the Library of Remembrance, a compilation of more than 4,500 books, documents, and videos about the injustice of genocide, bullying, and intolerance.

As long as he was able, well into his eighties, Werner spoke to school groups at the museum and around the State teaching them about his experience during the Holocaust and as a refugee in Shanghai. Werner took his own terrible experience and set about to make a better, more understanding, more tolerant world for others. While we lost Werner on November 9, 2019, at age 93,

his commitment to ending genocide, intolerance, and bullying will live on through the Albuquerque Holocaust and Intolerance Museum.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 9:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills

S. 50. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 216. An act to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

S. 737. An act to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood.

H.R. 150. An act to modernize Federal grant reporting, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. An act to reauthorize the West Valley demonstration project, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2333. An act to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of Department of Veterans Affairs suicide prevention coordinators, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4566. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of the families of victims of the mass shooting in Virginia Beach, Virginia, on May 31, 2019.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1790. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. PORTMAN).

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 397. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1759. An act to amend title III of the Social Security Act to extend reemployment services and eligibility assessments to all claimants for unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4018. An act to provide that the amount of time that an elderly offender must serve before being eligible for placement in home detention is to be reduced by the amount of good time credits earned by the prisoner, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3148. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 19, 2019, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 50. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 216. An act to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

S. 256. An act to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

S. 737. An act to direct the National Science Foundation to support STEM education research focused on early childhood.

S. 1790. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 7:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 151. An act to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

H.R. 777. An act to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

H.R. 1158. An act making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1865. An act making further consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3196. An act to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the "Vera C. Rubin Observatory".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. HOEVEN).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3576. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program" (RIN0575-AD09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3577. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, transmitting, pursuant to law, a review of mental health professionals and challenges in recruiting and retaining, to accompany the fiscal year 2020 Defense Health Program budget submission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3578. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2019-0003)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3579. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Limiting Extensions of Trail Use Negotiating Periods; Rails-To-Trails Conservancy—Petition for Rule-making" ((RIN2140-AB42) (Docket No. EP 749 (Sub-No. 1))) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 13, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3580. A communication from the Attorney, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2013 Liquid Chemical Categorization Updates" ((RIN1625-AB94) (Docket No. USCG-2019-0423)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3581. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule on Public Utility Transmission Rate Changes to Address Accumulated Deferred Income Taxes" ((RIN1902-AF57) (Docket No. RM19-5-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3582. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019-0118-2019-0125); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3583. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Valuation of Benefits and Assets; Expected Retirement

Age" (29 CFR Part 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on December 18, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3584. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Performance and Accountability Report for fiscal year 2019, including the Office of Inspector General's Auditor's Report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3585. A communication from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of Housing and Urban Development Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2019 through September 30, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3586. A joint communication from the Chief Executive Officer and the Chief Operating Officer of the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Armed Forces Retirement Home Performance and Accountability Report and Senior Medical Advisor Report for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3587. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on Investigation, Enforcement, and Implementation of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act Requirements"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-172. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to immigration and the English language; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 496. A bill to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-83).

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2020" (Rept. No. 116-181).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 149. A bill to establish a Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Council (Rept. No. 116-182).

S. 893. A bill to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-184).

S. 2166. A bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and At-

mospheric Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-185).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled "Measuring the Economic Impact of Broadband Act of 2019" (Rept. No. 116-186).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled "Veterans Expedited TSA Screening Safe Travel Act" (Rept. No. 116-187).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled "TSA Credential and Endorsement Harmonization Act of 2019" (Rept. No. 116-188).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 886. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent (Rept. No. 116-189).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 3106. A bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to promote reforestation following unplanned events on Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 3107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a tax credit for installation of regionally-significant electric power transmission lines; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 3108. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide that the consumer transaction account deposits of an insured depository institution are not considered to be funds obtained by or through a deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 3109. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to initiate a rulemaking to reform the interregional transmission planning process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. 3110. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on disability and pension benefits provided to members of the National Guard and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. JONES, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 3111. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to exclude affiliates and subsidiaries of insured depository institutions from the definition of deposit broker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3112. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand and improve health savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 3113. A bill to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Fort Belknap Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI:

S. 3114. A bill to require that all institutions of higher education participating in student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 meet certain revenue requirements; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARASSO, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 3115. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for comprehensive student achievement information; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3116. A bill to enable States to better provide access to whole genome sequencing clinical services for certain undiagnosed children under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3117. A bill to create dedicated funds to conserve butterflies in North America, plants in the Pacific Islands, freshwater mussels in the United States, and desert fish in the Southwest United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3118. A bill to establish a unified database and public reporting for purposes of tracking and evaluating domestic terrorism incidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3119. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3120. A bill to reauthorize the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3121. A bill to establish the Chiricahua National Park in the State of Arizona as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

S. 3122. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress an annual report on suicide among veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3123. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act with respect to the registration and supervision of insurance savings and loan holding companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 3124. A bill to improve passenger vessel security and safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 3125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for contributions to the Alzheimer's Research and Caregiving Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3126. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize a special behavioral health program for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. SINEMA:

S. 3127. A bill to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, to provide for a study relating to the uranium stockpile in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 3128. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reorganize the Chaplain Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURR, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3129. A bill to provide for certain reforms with respect to the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3130. A bill to amend titles 10 and 18, to permit members of the Armed Forces to possess firearms on military installations in accordance with applicable State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3131. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a Maya Security and Conservation Partnership program, to authorize appropriations for that program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3132. A bill to extend the Undertaking Spam, Spyware, And Fraud Enforcement With Enforcers beyond Borders Act of 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 3133. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited conditional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3134. A bill to add Ireland to the E-3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 3135. A bill to provide for the establishment of clean technology consortia to enhance the economic, environmental, and energy security of the United States by promoting domestic development, manufacture, and deployment of clean technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3136. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish small business start-up savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3137. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to require hospitals and certain other participating providers under Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program to disclose the provider's policy on parental access to the medical records of minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3138. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to require hospitals and certain other participating providers under Medicaid or the Children's Health Insurance Program to disclose the provider's policy on parental consent from the provision, withdrawal, or denial of life-sustaining treatment for minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3139. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3140. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to issue a final rule relating to the delisting of the gray wolf under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3141. A bill to amend the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act to clarify and expand food donation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3142. A bill to establish the Interagency United States-Based Terrorism Threat Information Sharing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 3143. A bill to ban certain rare earth magnets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3144. A bill to establish a competitive grant program to support out-of-school-time youth workforce readiness programs, providing employability skills development, career exploration, employment readiness training, mentoring, work-based learning, and workforce opportunities for eligible youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3145. A bill to extend the withdrawal and reservation of certain public land in the State of Nevada for the continued use of the Nevada test and training range, to designate certain land in the Desert National Wildlife Refuge as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BROWN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WARNER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, and Mr. KING):

S. 3146. A bill to ensure a fair process for negotiations of collective bargaining agree-

ments under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 3147. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress reports on patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3148. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; read the first time.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 458. A resolution calling for the global repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 459. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 460. A resolution congratulating the American Geophysical Union on the occasion of its centennial; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 461. A resolution congratulating Seattle Sounders FC on winning the 2019 Major League Soccer Cup; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 462. A resolution designating January 2020 as "National One Health Awareness Month" to promote awareness of organizations focused on public health, animal health, and environmental health collaboration throughout the United States and to recognize the critical contributions of those organizations to the future of the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 182

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 182, a bill to prohibit discrimination against the unborn on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 481

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, his name was added as a cosponsor of

S. 481, a bill to encourage States to require the installation of residential carbon monoxide detectors in homes, and for other purposes.

S. 500

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 500, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 604

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 614

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 614, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to reissue a final rule relating to removing the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem population of grizzly bears from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife.

S. 712

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 712, a bill to provide assistance for United States citizens and nationals taken hostage or unlawfully or wrongfully detained abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 877

At the request of Mr. UDALL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 877, a bill to prohibit the sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 944

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 944, a bill to enhance the security operations of the Transportation Security Administration and the stability of the transportation security workforce by applying a unified personnel system under title 5, United States Code, to employees of the Transportation Security Administration who are responsible for screening passengers and property, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to amend the Health

Insurance Portability and Accountability Act.

S. 1267

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1267, a bill to establish within the Smithsonian Institution the National Museum of the American Latino, and for other purposes.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1527

At the request of Mr. KING, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1527, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct, and submit to Congress a report describing the results of, an assessment of the total amount of nonhighway recreational fuel taxes received by the Secretary of the Treasury and transferred to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 1762

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1762, a bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to provide the Attorney General with greater authority to promote enforcement and disclosure requirements for agents of foreign principals, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1766, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1781

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1781, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2020 through 2022 to provide assistance to El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras through bilateral compacts to increase protection of women and children in their homes and communities and reduce female homicides, domestic violence, and sexual assault.

S. 1820

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1820, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of horseracing by requiring a uniform anti-doping and medication control program to be developed and enforced by an independent Horseracing Anti-Doping and Medication Control Authority.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2322

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2322, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to allow for the retirement of certain animals used in Federal research.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to provide for congressional oversight of the board of directors of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Committee and to protect amateur athletes from emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and for other purposes.

S. 2379

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2379, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units to investigate and prosecute cases of Medicaid patient abuse and neglect in any setting, and for other purposes.

S. 2381

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2381, a bill to require review by the Government Accountability Office of screening protocols of the Transportation Security Administration relating to breast milk and formula, and for other purposes.

S. 2469

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2469, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to require the use of advanced leak detection technology for pipelines, and for other purposes.

S. 2491

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2491, a bill to terminate certain rules issued by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce relating to endangered and threatened species, and for other purposes.

S. 2549

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2549, a bill to allow nonprofit child care providers to participate in the loan programs of the Small Business Administration.

S. 2556

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2556, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide energy cybersecurity investment incentives, to establish a grant and technical assistance program for cybersecurity investments, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2570, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond in recognition of his service to the United States as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader.

S. 2590

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2590, a bill to protect the dignity of fetal remains, and for other purposes.

S. 2695

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2695, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for the defense of United States agriculture and food through the National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility, and for other purposes.

S. 2702

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2702, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an integrated energy systems research, development, and demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 2741

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from

North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2741, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 2743

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2743, a bill to establish the China Censorship Monitor and Action Group, and for other purposes.

S. 2745

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2745, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit discrimination by abortion against an unborn child on the basis of Down syndrome.

S. 2748

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2748, a bill to repeal the section of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 that requires the Federal Communications Commission to reallocate and auction the T-Band spectrum.

S. 2766

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2766, a bill to support and expand civic engagement and political leadership of adolescent girls around the world, and other purposes.

S. 2831

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2831, a bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to modify the national space grant college and fellowship program, and for other purposes.

S. 2836

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2836, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from taking any action to implement, enforce, or otherwise give effect to the final rule, entitled "Protecting Statutory Conscience Rights in Health Care; Delegations of Authority".

S. 2886

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2886, a bill to prohibit the use of animal testing for cosmetics and the sale of cosmetics tested on animals.

S. 2943

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2943, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to revise minimum nurse staffing requirements for skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare pro-

gram and for nursing facilities under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes.

S. 2970

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2970, a bill to improve the fielding of newest generations of personal protective equipment to the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 2974

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2974, a bill to require the Postmaster General to establish a comprehensive organizational strategy to combat the use of the mail in the distribution of illicit drugs.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3016

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3016, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure that consumers can make informed decisions in choosing between meat products such as beef and imitation meat products, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3055

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3055, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to permit a Federal student loan borrower to elect to terminate repayment pursuant to income-based repayment and repay such loan under any other repayment plan for which the borrower is otherwise eligible.

S. 3062

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3062, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to repeal a certain exemption for hydraulic fracturing, and for other purposes.

S. 3104

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms.

DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3104, a bill to make technical corrections relating to parental leave for Federal employees.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S. RES. 73

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 73, a resolution calling on the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to immediately release Saudi Women's Rights activists and respect the fundamental rights of all Saudi citizens.

S. RES. 452

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 452, a resolution commemorating and supporting the goals of World AIDS Day.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. JONES, Ms. MCSALLY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3116. A bill to enable States to better provide access to whole genome sequencing clinical services for certain undiagnosed children under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Ending the Diagnostic Odyssey Act. This legislation gives States the option of providing whole genome sequencing WSG clinical services through Medicaid for children with a disease that is suspected to have a genetic cause, at an enhanced Federal matching rate for 3 years. I am pleased to be joined by Senators JONES, MCSALLY, and MENENDEZ.

Children with rare diseases will spend on average 5 to 7 years on diagnostic odyssey, and 30 percent of those children will not survive beyond the age of 5 years old. The average patient sees seven different physicians in that time. The wait to find a cause—nevermind a cure—can be excruciating. Parents try to project a calm and reassuring presence for their child while facing a

whirlwind of doctor appointments, hospital visits, and unanswered questions.

Undeniably, we are making progress in both accelerating research funding for rare diseases as well as in the development of diagnostics. In 2014, the National Institutes of Health, NIH launched a program called the Undiagnosed Disease Network UDN. In its first 20 months, the UDN accepted 601 participants undiagnosed by traditional medical practices. Of those who completed their UDN evaluation during this time, 35 percent were given a diagnosis. Many of these diagnoses were rare genetic diseases, including 31 previously unknown syndromes.

In May, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. Francis Collins, wrote a blog post on how whole genome sequencing—combined with artificial intelligence, AI—can now be used to diagnose genetic diseases in seriously ill babies in fewer than 24 hours. Dr. Collins writes: “I would submit that there is no other technology in the history of planet Earth that has experienced this degree of progress in speed and affordability.”

For parents of children with an undiagnosed illness, answers cannot come soon enough. There are approximately 7,000 rare diseases known today. Approximately 80 percent of rare diseases are genetic, and about one-half of all rare diseases affect children. For example, Alström syndrome is an extremely rare and complex genetic disorder. Approximately 1,200 affected individuals have been identified worldwide, which makes a obtaining a correct diagnosis challenging. Characteristics of Alström syndrome include vision disturbances, sensorineural hearing impairment, cardiomyopathy, obesity, kidney dysfunction, and diabetes.

Robin Marshall, executive director of the Alström Syndrome International, located in Mount Desert Island, ME, has said that “whole Genome Sequencing has changed the lives of those we represent by enabling earlier and more accurate diagnosis, fostering more timely and appropriate medical care, and unlocking a host of social services to combat the educational and psychosocial complications that our children confront.”

By giving States an incentive to provide whole genome sequencing for eligible children through Medicaid my legislation will ensure that more children and their families can obtain the right diagnosis and treatment the start. The Ending the Diagnostic Odyssey Act has the support of more than 100 patient advocacy organizations, including Alström Syndrome International, the Genetic Alliance, the Personalized Medicine Coalition, and many others. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 3147. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to

Congress reports on patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

S. 3147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Improving Safety and Security for Veterans Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REPORTS ON PATIENT SAFETY AND QUALITY OF CARE.

(a) REPORT ON PATIENT SAFETY AND QUALITY OF CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report regarding the policies and procedures of the Department relating to patient safety and quality of care and the steps that the Department has taken to make improvements in patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the policies and procedures of the Department and improvements made by the Department with respect to the following:

(i) How often the Department reviews or inspects patient safety at medical centers of the Department.

(ii) What triggers the aggregated review process at medical centers of the Department.

(iii) What controls the Department has in place for controlled and other high-risk substances, including the following:

(I) Access to such substances by staff.

(II) What medications are dispensed via automation.

(III) What systems are in place to ensure proper matching of the correct medication to the correct patient.

(IV) Controls of items such as medication carts and pill bottles and vials.

(V) Monitoring of the dispensing of medication within medical centers of the Department, including monitoring of unauthorized dispensing.

(iv) How the Department monitors contact between patients and employees of the Department, including how employees are monitored and tracked at medical centers of the Department when entering and exiting the room of a patient.

(v) How comprehensively the Department uses video monitoring systems in medical centers of the Department to enhance patient safety, security, and quality of care.

(vi) How the Department tracks and reports deaths at medical centers of the Department at the local level, Veterans Integrated Service Network level, and national level.

(vii) The procedures of the Department to alert local, regional, and Department-wide leadership when there is a statistically abnormal number of deaths at a medical center of the Department, including—

(I) the manner and frequency in which such alerts are made; and

(II) what is included in such an alert, such as the nature of death and where within the medical center the death occurred.

(viii) The use of root cause analyses with respect to patient deaths in medical centers of the Department, including—

(I) what threshold triggers a root cause analysis for a patient death;

(II) who conducts the root cause analysis; and

(III) how root cause analyses determine whether a patient death is suspicious or not.

(ix) What triggers a patient safety alert, including how many suspicious deaths cause a patient safety alert to be triggered.

(x) The situations in which an autopsy report is ordered for deaths at hospitals of the Department, including an identification of—

(I) when the medical examiner is called to review a patient death; and

(II) the official or officials that decide such a review is necessary.

(xi) The method for family members of a patient who died at a medical center of the Department to request an investigation into that death.

(xii) The opportunities that exist for family members of a patient who died at a medical center of the Department to request an autopsy for that death.

(xiii) The methods in place for employees of the Department to report suspicious deaths at medical centers of the Department.

(xiv) The steps taken by the Department if an employee of the Department is suspected to be implicated in a suspicious death at a medical center of the Department, including—

(I) actions to remove or suspend that individual from patient care or temporarily reassign that individual and the speed at which that action occurs; and

(II) steps taken to ensure that other medical centers of the Department and other non-Department medical centers are aware of the suspected role of the individual in a suspicious death.

(xv) In the case of the suspicious death of an individual while under care at a medical center of the Department, the methods used by the Department to inform the family members of that individual.

(xvi) The policy of the Department for communicating to the public when a suspicious death occurs at a medical center of the Department.

(B) A description of any additional authorities or resources needed from Congress to implement any of the actions, changes to policy, or other matters included in the report required under paragraph (1)

(b) REPORT ON DEATHS AT LOUIS A. JOHNSON MEDICAL CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Attorney General indicates that any investigation or trial related to the suspicious deaths of veterans at the Louis A. Johnson VA Medical Center in Clarksburg, West Virginia, (in this subsection referred to as the “Facility”) that occurred during 2017 and 2018 has sufficiently concluded, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(A) the events that occurred during that period related to those suspicious deaths; and

(B) actions taken at the Facility and throughout the Department of Veterans Affairs to prevent any similar reoccurrence of the issues that contributed to those suspicious deaths.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A timeline of events that occurred at the Facility relating to the suspicious deaths described in paragraph (1) beginning the moment those deaths were first determined to be suspicious, including any notifications to—

(i) leadership of the Facility;

(ii) leadership of the Veterans Integrated Service Network in which the Facility is located;

(iii) leadership at the central office of the Department; and

(iv) the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) A description of the actions taken by leadership of the Facility, the Veterans Integrated Service Network in which the Facility is located, and the central office of the Department in response to the suspicious deaths, including responses to notifications under subparagraph (A).

(C) A description of the actions, including root cause analyses, autopsies, or other activities that were conducted after each of the suspicious deaths.

(D) A description of the changes made by the Department since the suspicious deaths to procedures to control access within medical centers of the Department to controlled and non-controlled substances to prevent harm to patients.

(E) A description of the changes made by the Department to its nationwide controlled substance and non-controlled substance policies as a result of the suspicious deaths.

(F) A description of the changes planned or made by the Department to its video surveillance at medical centers of the Department to improve patient safety and quality of care in response to the suspicious deaths.

(G) An analysis of the review of sentinel events conducted at the Facility in response to the suspicious deaths and whether that review was conducted consistent with policies and procedures of the Department.

(H) A description of the steps the Department has taken or will take to improve the monitoring of the credentials of employees of the Department to ensure the validity of those credentials, including all employees that interact with patients in the provision of medical care.

(I) A description of the steps the Department has taken or will take to monitor and mitigate the behavior of employee bad actors, including those who attempt to conceal their mistreatment of veteran patients.

(J) A description of the steps the Department has taken or will take to enhance or create new monitoring systems that—

(i) automatically collect and analyze data from medical centers of the Department and monitor for warnings signs or unusual health patterns that may indicate a health safety or quality problem at a particular medical center; and

(ii) automatically share those warnings with other medical centers of the Department, relevant Veterans Integrated Service Networks, and officials of the central office of the Department.

(K) A description of the accountability actions that have been taken at the Facility to remove or discipline employees who significantly participated in the actions that contributed to the suspicious deaths.

(L) A description of the system-wide reporting process that the Department will or has implemented to ensure that relevant employees are properly reported, when applicable, to the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services, the applicable State licensing boards, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and other relevant entities.

(M) A description of any additional authorities or resources needed from Congress to implement any of the recommendations or findings included in the report required under paragraph (1).

(N) Such other matters as the Secretary considers necessary.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr.

McCONNELL, and Mr. LANKFORD);

S. 3148. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances; read the first time.

S. 3148

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Stopping Overdoses of Fentanyl Analogues Act”.

SEC. 2. FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of subsection (b) of Schedule I the following:

“(23) Isobutyryl fentanyl.

“(24) Para-Methoxybutyrylfentanyl.

“(25) Valeryl fentanyl.

“(26) Cyclopentyl fentanyl.

“(27) Para-Chloroisobutyryl fentanyl.”;

and

(2) by adding at the end of Schedule I the following:

“(e)(1) Unless specifically exempted or unless listed in another schedule, any material, compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of fentanyl-related substances, or which contains their salts, isomers, and salts of isomers whenever the existence of such salts, isomers, and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation.

“(2) In paragraph (1), the term ‘fentanyl-related substances’ includes the following:

“(A) Any substance that is structurally related to fentanyl by one or more of the following modifications:

“(i) By replacement of the phenyl portion of the phenethyl group by any monocycle, whether or not further substituted in or on the monocycle.

“(ii) By substitution in or on the phenethyl group with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxy, hydroxy, halo, haloalkyl, amino or nitro groups.

“(iii) By substitution in or on the piperidine ring with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxy, ester, ether, hydroxy, halo, haloalkyl, amino or nitro groups.

“(iv) By replacement of the aniline ring with any aromatic monocycle whether or not further substituted in or on the aromatic monocycle.

“(v) By replacement of the N-propionyl group by another acyl group.

“(B) 4'-Methyl acetyl fentanyl.

“(C) Crotonyl fentanyl.

“(D) 2'-Fluoro ortho-fluorofentanyl.

“(E) Ortho-Methyl acetylfentanyl.

“(F) Thiofuranyl fentanyl.

“(G) Ortho-Fluorobutyryl fentanyl.

“(H) Ortho-Fluoroacryl fentanyl.

“(I) Beta-Methyl fentanyl.

“(J) Phenyl fentanyl.

“(K) Para-Methylfentanyl.

“(L) Beta'-Phenyl fentanyl.

“(M) Benzodioxole fentanyl.”.

This act shall take effect one day after the date of enactment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 458—CALLING FOR THE GLOBAL REPEAL OF BLASPHEMY, HERESY, AND APOSTASY LAWS

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 458

Whereas Article 18 of the International Declaration of Human Rights states that “[e]veryone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance”;

Whereas many countries continue to have criminal blasphemy laws and punish people who engage in expression deemed by the government to be blasphemous, heretical, apostate, defamatory of religion, or insulting to religion or to religious symbols, figures, or feelings, and such punishment can include fines, imprisonment, and capital punishment including by beheading;

Whereas blasphemy laws have affected Christians, Muslims, Hindus, Baha’i, secularists, and many other groups, are inconsistent with international human rights standards because they establish and promote official religious orthodoxy and dogma over individual liberty, and often result in violations of the freedoms of religion, thought, and expression that are protected under international instruments, including Articles 18 and 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR);

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Committee stated in General Comment 34 that “[p]rohibitions of displays of lack of respect for a religion or other belief system, including blasphemy laws, are incompatible with the [ICCPR].”;

Whereas the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom (USCIRF) has found that blasphemy charges are often based on false accusations, are used for sectarian or political purposes, and foster religious intolerance, discrimination, and violence;

Whereas USCIRF has found that at least 70 countries had blasphemy laws as of 2018;

Whereas these laws were present in 18 Middle East and North African countries, 8 countries in the Americas, 18 Asia-Pacific countries, 14 European countries, and 12 Sub-Saharan African countries;

Whereas the Pew Research Center found that countries with laws against blasphemy, apostasy, or defamation of religion were more likely to have severe governmental restrictions on religion, and to experience social hostilities based on religion, than countries that did not have such laws;

Whereas restrictive laws beyond those penalizing blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy further limit religious freedom, such as extremism laws—

(1) in Russia that have been used to ban Jehovah’s Witnesses as an extremist organization and fueled persecution of this religious group;

(2) in China, to arbitrarily detain an estimated 800,000 to 2,000,000 Uighur Muslims in internment camps because they followed Islamic rituals and practices; and

(3) in North Korea, to detain an estimated 50,000 to 70,000 Christians in labor camps because they followed the tenets of Christianity;

Whereas an international group of experts convened by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights recommended in 2012 that “[s]tates that have blasphemy laws should repeal the[m] as such laws have a stifling impact on the enjoyment of freedom of religion or belief and healthy dialogue and debate about religion.”;

Whereas blasphemy laws are inconsistent with United Nations resolutions adopted by consensus since 2011 recognizing that religious intolerance is best fought through positive measures, such as education, out-

reach, and counter-speech, and that criminalization of speech is warranted only for the prevention of imminent violence;

Whereas, according to the annual religious freedom report published by the Department of State in 2015, attackers in Bangladesh killed five allegedly anti-Islamic or secularist writers and publishers, and injured three others;

Whereas, in response to these killings, the Home Minister of Bangladesh, rather than condemning the murders, called on bloggers and others to refrain from writings that could hurt the religious feelings of others and added that violators of the warning would be subject to prosecution under the restrictive religious freedom laws of Bangladesh;

Whereas a 2016 report by USCIRF on Bangladesh found that religious and civil society groups fear that increasing religious extremism will result in more criminal attacks and threats;

Whereas restrictive religious freedom laws validate and promote social violence targeted at religious minorities and dissenters, whether Christian, Muslim, secularist, or other;

Whereas USCIRF has found that in Pakistan, blasphemy laws have been used to prosecute and persecute Muslims, Christians, secularists, and others;

Whereas, according to a Pew Center report on religion and public life, Pakistan stands out for having one of the highest levels of restrictions on religion when both government restrictions and social hostilities are taken into account;

Whereas USCIRF has found egregious examples of the enforcement of blasphemy laws and vigilante violence connected to blasphemy allegations in Pakistan, where blasphemy charges are common and numerous individuals are in prison, with a high percentage sentenced to death or to life in prison;

Whereas, as of May 2018, USCIRF was aware of approximately 40 individuals on death row for blasphemy in Pakistan or serving life sentences;

Whereas Asia Bibi was sentenced to death for blasphemy in 2010 and was held on death row for 8 years, until the Supreme Court of Pakistan overturned her conviction in 2018, and has since received asylum in Canada;

Whereas Pakistan selectively enforces the blasphemy law against minority religious groups, including specifically targeting the Ahmadis, such as Abdul Shakoor, an 82-year old bookseller who was recently released after serving four years in prison on blasphemy charges;

Whereas blasphemy laws in Pakistan have fostered a climate of impunity, as those who falsify evidence go unpunished and allegations often result in violent mob attacks or assassinations, with little to no police response;

Whereas, in 2017, the Christian Governor of Jakarta, Indonesia, was convicted for blasphemy of Islam and sentenced to two years in jail;

Whereas several countries that maintained blasphemy laws have recently taken steps towards removing these provisions, including Greece, Ireland and Canada;

Whereas blasphemy laws in the United States were invalidated by the adoption of the First Amendment to the Constitution, which protects the freedoms of thought, conscience, expression, and religious exercise; and

Whereas the United States has become a beacon of religious freedom and tolerance around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws inappropriately position gov-

ernments as arbiters of religious truth and empower officials to impose religious dogma on individuals or minorities through the power of the government or through violence sanctioned by the government;

(2) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to make the repeal of blasphemy, heresy, and apostasy laws a priority in the bilateral relationships of the United States with all countries that have such laws, through direct interventions in bilateral and multilateral fora;

(3) encourages the President and the Secretary of State to oppose—

(A) any efforts, by the United Nations or by other international or multilateral fora, to create an international anti-blasphemy norm, such as the “defamation of religions” resolutions introduced in the United Nations between 1999 and 2010; and

(B) any attempts to expand the international norm on incitement to include blasphemy or defamation of religions;

(4) supports efforts by the United Nations to combat intolerance, discrimination, or violence against persons based on religion or belief without restricting expression, including United Nations Human Rights Council Resolution 16/18 (2011) and the Istanbul Process meetings pursuant to such resolution, that are consistent with the First Amendment to the Constitution;

(5) calls on the President and the Secretary of State to designate countries that enforce blasphemy, heresy, or apostasy laws as “countries of particular concern for religious freedom” under section 402(b)(1)(A)(ii) of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6442(b)(1)(A)(ii)) for engaging in or tolerating severe violations of religious freedom, as a result of the abuses flowing from the enforcement of such laws and from unpunished vigilante violence often generated by blasphemy allegations;

(6) urges the governments of countries that enforce blasphemy, heresy, or apostasy laws to amend or repeal such laws, as they provide pretext and impunity for vigilante violence against religious minorities; and

(7) urges the governments of countries that have prosecuted, imprisoned, and persecuted people on charges of blasphemy, heresy, or apostasy to release such people unconditionally and, once released, to ensure their safety and that of their families.

SENATE RESOLUTION 459—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY’S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 459

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party’s membership on the following committee for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Lankford (Chairman), Mr. Roberts, Mr. Risch.

SENATE RESOLUTION 460—CONGRATULATING THE AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS CENTENNIAL

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following

resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 460

Whereas, in December 1919, the National Research Council organized the American Geophysical Union—

(1) to represent the United States in the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics of the International Research Council; and

(2) to serve as the Committee on Geophysics of the National Research Council to promote work in the fields of astronomy, geodesy, geology, meteorology, seismology, terrestrial electricity and magnetism, and volcanology;

Whereas, in 1972, the American Geophysical Union was incorporated as an independent organization;

Whereas, in 2019, the American Geophysical Union has more than 60,000 members in 137 countries;

Whereas the mission of the American Geophysical Union is to promote discovery in Earth and space sciences for the benefit of humanity;

Whereas Earth and space sciences are international endeavors that transform human understanding of the planet, from the core through the atmosphere of the planet and into the universe beyond;

Whereas Earth and space sciences drive basic and applied research that has led to critical health, environmental, commercial, and technological breakthroughs that have inspired individuals throughout the world, strengthened economies, and raised standards of living;

Whereas Earth and space sciences help individuals—

(1) understand and formulate solutions for the critical challenges facing the planet;

(2) become better stewards of natural resources, such as energy, water, and minerals, for current and future generations; and

(3) comprehend and mitigate the effects of terrestrial, manmade, and space disasters, which protects communities worldwide;

Whereas Earth and space sciences are critical components of a science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics (in this preamble referred to as “STEAM”) education and inspire students of all ages to become citizen scientists and future leaders in STEAM fields;

Whereas Earth and space sciences seek to discover the origins of humanity, the planet, and the universe, and are a source of awe for past, current, and future generations; and

Whereas December 2019 marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the American Geophysical Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the American Geophysical Union on the occasion of its centennial;

(2) supports increasing the understanding of and interest in Earth and space sciences at the local, national, and international levels;

(3) encourages the scientific community to engage in public outreach so that individuals of all ages and backgrounds gain a better understanding of and appreciation for the value of Earth and space sciences to daily life and quality of life;

(4) expresses support for the free and open exchange of ideas in Earth and space sciences;

(5) recognizes the important role of governments in fostering Earth and space scientific research, including contributing to higher-risk and longer-term investigations and providing funding for the basic and applied research necessary for human welfare;

(6) encourages international cooperation in efforts relating to Earth and space sciences to foster the global exchange of knowledge and collaboration among scientists worldwide for the benefit of humanity; and

(7) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the executive director and chief executive officer of the American Geophysical Union.

SENATE RESOLUTION 461—CONGRATULATING SEATTLE SOUNDERS FC ON WINNING THE 2019 MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER CUP

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 461

Whereas, on November 10, 2019, Seattle Sounders FC won the 2019 Major League Soccer Cup;

Whereas that win on November 10, 2019, is the second Major League Soccer championship won by Seattle Sounders FC in the 11 years that Seattle Sounders FC has been in Major League Soccer;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC beat the Toronto Football Club 3-1 in the 2019 Major League Soccer Cup;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC—

(1) dominated the competition in the regular season, with 16 wins and 10 losses;

(2) qualified for the Major League Soccer Cup Playoffs for an unprecedented 11th straight season; and

(3) earned the number 2 seed in the Major League Soccer Western Conference;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC plays home games at CenturyLink Field in Seattle, Washington, and, on November 10, 2019, 69,274 Seattle Sounders FC fans from across the State of Washington packed CenturyLink Field and set the record for the largest crowd at a sporting event in the 17-year history of the stadium;

Whereas the 2019 roster of Seattle Sounders FC players includes—

(1) Saad Abdul-Salaam;

(2) Xavier Arreaga;

(3) Will Bruin;

(4) Handwalla Bwana;

(5) Jonathan Campbell;

(6) Emanuel Cecchini;

(7) Jordy Delem;

(8) Justin Dhillon;

(9) Stefan Frei;

(10) Bheem Goyal;

(11) Joevin Jones;

(12) Kim Kee-hee;

(13) Kelvin Leerdam;

(14) Danny Leyva;

(15) Nicolás Lodeiro;

(16) Chad Marshall;

(17) Bryan Meredith;

(18) Jordan Morris;

(19) Trey Muse;

(20) Alfonso Ocampo-Chavez;

(21) Víctor Rodríguez;

(22) Cristian Roldan;

(23) Alex Roldan;

(24) Raúl Ruidíaz;

(25) Harry Shipp;

(26) Luis Silva;

(27) Brad Smith;

(28) Gustav Svensson;

(29) Nouhou; and

(30) Román Torres;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC defender Kelvin Leerdam scored the first goal in the 57th minute of the championship game;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC midfielder Víctor Rodríguez—

(1) scored the second goal in the 76th minute; and

(2) received the 2019 Major League Soccer Cup Most Valuable Player award;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC forward Raúl Ruidíaz scored the third and final goal in the 90th minute;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC forward Jordan Morris—

(1) scored a career-high 13 goals and a career-high 8 assists throughout the 2019 season; and

(2) received the 2019 Major League Soccer Comeback Player of the Year award after suffering a torn anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) in 2018;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC Head Coach Brian Schmetzer won his second Major League Soccer Cup;

Whereas the 2019 Seattle Sounders FC coaching and technical staff includes—

(1) Head Coach Brian Schmetzer;

(2) Assistant Coach Gonzalo Pineda;

(3) Assistant Coach Djimi Traore;

(4) Assistant Coach Preki;

(5) Club Director of Goalkeeping Tom Dutra;

(6) General Manager and President of Soccer Garth Lagerwey; and

(7) Vice President of Soccer Chris Henderson;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC is owned by Adrian Hanauer, Drew Carey, Jody Allen, and Peter Tomozawa, and the 11 families that joined the ownership contingent in 2019, namely—

(1) Terry Myerson and Katie Myerson;

(2) Russell Wilson and Ciara;

(3) Benjamin Haggerty “Macklemore” and Tricia Davis;

(4) Satya Nadella and Anu Nadella;

(5) Amy Hood and Max Kleinman;

(6) Joe Belfiore and Kristina Belfiore;

(7) Soma Somasegar and Akila Somasegar;

(8) Chee Chew and Christine Chew;

(9) David Nathanson and Sabina Nathanson;

(10) Brian McAndrews and Elise Holschuh; and

(11) Mark Agne and Tomoko Agne;

Whereas the owners of Seattle Sounders FC have built a culture of success and contributed greatly to Seattle, Washington, and the surrounding region through philanthropy;

Whereas Seattle Sounders FC has exhibited dedication to positive social impacts by strengthening communities through the RAVE Foundation partnership with organizations in Seattle, Washington, and the surrounding region; and

Whereas the dedication and hard work of Seattle Sounders FC has inspired and empowered girls, boys, women, and men of all ages: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes Seattle Sounders FC for winning the 2019 Major League Soccer Cup;

(2) applauds the people of Seattle, Washington, and the surrounding region for their enthusiastic support of Seattle Sounders FC;

(3) supports equity in men’s and women’s professional sports; and

(4) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to Seattle Sounders FC Head Coach Brian Schmetzer, General Manager and President of Soccer Garth Lagerwey, and Vice President of Soccer Chris Henderson.

SENATE RESOLUTION 462—DESIGNATING JANUARY 2020 AS “NATIONAL ONE HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH” TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF ORGANIZATIONS FOCUSED ON PUBLIC HEALTH, ANIMAL HEALTH, AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH COLLABORATION THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND TO RECOGNIZE THE CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF THOSE ORGANIZATIONS TO THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 462

Whereas One Health is a collaborative, multisectoral, and transdisciplinary approach, working at the local, regional, national, and global levels, with the goal of achieving optimal health outcomes recognizing the interconnection between people, animals, plants, and their shared environment;

Whereas the mission of One Health is to establish closer professional interactions, collaborations, and educational opportunities across the various medical, veterinary, and environmental health professions and their allied science professions to simultaneously improve public health, animal health, and environmental health;

Whereas the increasing threats posed by emerging diseases shared between animals and people, foodborne, vector-borne, and waterborne diseases, and other environmental factors may support the need for an integrated effort by professionals from multiple disciplines, including health, science, technology, and engineering;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, up to 75 percent of new or emerging infectious diseases in people are spread by animals;

Whereas, each year, International One Health Day is November 3; and

Whereas One Health is essential to combating and strengthening the surveillance of emerging and reemerging diseases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates January 2020 as “National One Health Awareness Month” to—

- (1) promote awareness of organizations that focus on One Health efforts to improve the quality of life for people and animals;
- (2) recognize the efforts made by such organizations in using a One Health approach to prevent epidemics; and
- (3) recognize the importance of using the One Health approach to simultaneously protect the health of people, animals, plants, and the environment in the United States.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the resolution that Senator McSally and I introduced to declare January as “National One Health Awareness Month.”

“One Health” is a term used by health experts—including those at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—to focus on the connections between human, animal, and environmental health.

Our resolution will help raise awareness for the “One Health” approach and promote efforts that simultaneously improve the health of people, animals, plants, and the environment.

By using the One Health approach, global health problems including antibiotic resistance, infectious disease spread, and sequestered medical knowledge can be addressed.

Antibiotic resistance is of grave concern for both people and animals. Public health specialists are working with physicians and veterinarians to minimize inappropriate antibiotic usage in their patients.

By 2050, according to the United Kingdom’s 2014 Review on Antimicrobial Resistance, experts expect that more people will die from antibiotic resistant microbes than die from cancer today. The best way to solve this growing problem is for specialists across a variety of disciplines to collaborate to reduce antibiotic use by promoting good sanitation and developing alternatives for antibiotics.

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, up to 75 percent of new or emerging infectious diseases in people are spread by animals. Examples include Ebola, Zika, Rabies, Tuberculosis, and Plague. By destroying natural animal habitats through deforestation, natural disasters, and climate change, we are forcing animals and insects to migrate to new areas, thereby exposing humans to new diseases.

In 2013, a two-year-old boy was the first victim of the Ebola epidemic in Western Africa. In his small village, deforestation forced the bats suspected of carrying the Ebola virus to move closer to people.

Collaboration between physicians, nurses, physician assistants, nurse’s aids, veterinarians, hygienists, anthropologists, epidemiologists, community engagement specialists, and military workers helped end the Ebola epidemic by attacking it from different angles. This was an example of One Health in action. Today, a similar collaborative approach is working to end the current Ebola epidemic in Central Africa.

In the United States, diseases such as Lyme disease, Anaplasma, Bartonella, and Zika carried by ticks, fleas, and mosquitoes, respectively, are also spreading to new areas.

In 2015, an 11-year-old Louisiana boy was accidentally scratched by a kitten with fleas. He was misdiagnosed by more than thirty doctors and he became wheelchairbound. However, a “One Health” approach saved his life. The boy was finally correctly diagnosed with a bacterial disease acquired by the kitten’s scratch once he met with a medical team that included both a physician and a veterinarian. The veterinarian understood that fleas can give cats bacteria and the physician understood that a cat’s scratch can transmit the bacteria to humans. The boy was prescribed the antibiotics he needed, and he can now walk again.

It is time that everybody understands the importance of One Health. With diminishing resources in the environment and a growing human population, now more than ever, fighting

problems with a One Health approach must be encouraged.

Thank you Mr. President. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1268. Mr. WICKER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes.

SA 1269. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. PORTMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1434, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, and for other purposes.

SA 1270. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 439, to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan.

SA 1271. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 221, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, and for other purposes.

SA 1272. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BOOZMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2096, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize States and tribal organizations that receive grants from the National Cemetery Administration for establishment, expansion, or improvement of a veterans’ cemeteries to use amounts of such grants for State and tribal organization cemetery personnel to train at the training center of the National Cemetery Administration, and for other purposes.

SA 1273. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. CRUZ)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 550, to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

SA 1274. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1029, to allow the use of certified facility dogs in criminal proceedings in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

SA 1275. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1309, to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to assess United States assistance to designated countries in order to advance anti-corruption efforts in those countries and better serve United States taxpayers.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1268. Mr. WICKER proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Broadband Deployment Accuracy and Technological

Availability Act” or the “Broadband DATA Act”.

SEC. 2. BROADBAND DATA.

The Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“TITLE VIII—BROADBAND DATA

“SEC. 801. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.**—The term ‘broadband internet access service’ has the meaning given the term in section 8.1(b) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

“(2) **BROADBAND MAP.**—The term ‘Broadband Map’ means the map created by the Commission under section 802(c)(1)(A).

“(3) **CELL EDGE PROBABILITY.**—The term ‘cell edge probability’ means the likelihood that the minimum threshold download and upload speeds with respect to broadband internet access service will be met or exceeded at a distance from a base station that is intended to indicate the ultimate edge of the coverage area of a cell.

“(4) **CELL LOADING.**—The term ‘cell loading’ means the percentage of the available air interface resources of a base station that are used by consumers with respect to broadband internet access service.

“(5) **CLUTTER.**—The term ‘clutter’ means a natural or man-made surface feature that affects the propagation of a signal from a base station.

“(6) **FABRIC.**—The term ‘Fabric’ means the Broadband Serviceable Location Fabric established under section 802(b)(1)(B).

“(7) **FORM 477.**—The term ‘Form 477’ means Form 477 of the Commission relating to local telephone competition and broadband reporting.

“(8) **INDIAN TRIBE.**—The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given the term ‘Indian tribe’ in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(9) **MOBILITY FUND PHASE II.**—The term ‘Mobility Fund Phase II’ means the second phase of the proceeding to provide universal service support from the Mobility Fund (WC Docket No. 10-90; WT Docket No. 10-208).

“(10) **PROPAGATION MODEL.**—The term ‘propagation model’ means a mathematical formulation for the characterization of radio wave propagation as a function of frequency, distance, and other conditions.

“(11) **PROVIDER.**—The term ‘provider’ means a provider of fixed or mobile broadband internet access service.

“(12) **QUALITY OF SERVICE.**—The term ‘quality of service’ means, with respect to broadband internet access service, the download and upload speeds (and, for relevant services, latency) with respect to that service, as determined by, and to the extent otherwise collected by, the Commission.

“(13) **SHAPEFILE.**—The term ‘shapefile’ means a digital storage format containing geospatial or location-based data and attribute information—

“(A) regarding the availability of broadband internet access service; and

“(B) that can be viewed, edited, and mapped in geographic information system software.

“(14) **STANDARD BROADBAND INSTALLATION.**—The term ‘standard broadband installation’—

“(A) means the initiation by a provider of fixed broadband internet access service in an area in which the provider has not previously offered that service, with no charges or delays attributable to the extension of the network of the provider; and

“(B) includes the initiation of fixed broadband internet access service through routine installation that can be completed

not later than 10 business days after the date on which the service request is submitted.

“SEC. 802. BROADBAND MAPS.

“(a) **RULES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Commission shall issue final rules that shall—

“(A) require the biannual collection and dissemination of granular data, as determined by the Commission—

“(i) relating to the availability and quality of service with respect to terrestrial fixed, fixed wireless, satellite, and mobile broadband internet access service; and

“(ii) that the Commission shall use to compile the maps created under subsection (c)(1) (referred to in this section as ‘coverage maps’), which the Commission shall make publicly available; and

“(B) establish—

“(i) processes through which the Commission can verify the accuracy of data submitted under subsection (b)(2);

“(ii) processes and procedures through which the Commission, and, as necessary, other entities or individuals submitting non-public or competitively sensitive information under this title, can protect the security, privacy, and confidentiality of that non-public or competitively sensitive information, including—

“(I) information contained in the Fabric;

“(II) the dataset created under subsection (b)(1)(A) supporting the Fabric; and

“(III) the data submitted under subsection (b)(2);

“(iii) the challenge process described in subsection (b)(5); and

“(iv) the process described in section 804(b).

“(2) **OTHER DATA.**—In issuing the rules under paragraph (1), the Commission shall develop a process through which the Commission can collect verified data for use in the coverage maps from—

“(A) State, local, and Tribal governmental entities that are primarily responsible for mapping or tracking broadband internet access service coverage for a State, unit of local government, or Indian Tribe, as applicable;

“(B) third parties, if the Commission determines that it is in the public interest to use such data in—

“(i) the development of the coverage maps; or

“(ii) the verification of data submitted under subsection (b); and

“(C) other Federal agencies.

“(3) **UPDATES.**—The Commission shall revise the rules issued under paragraph (1) to—

“(A) reflect changes in technology;

“(B) ensure the accuracy of propagation models, as further provided in subsection (b)(3); and

“(C) improve the usefulness of the coverage maps.

“(b) **CONTENT OF RULES.**—

“(1) **ESTABLISHMENT OF A SERVICEABLE LOCATION FABRIC REGARDING FIXED BROADBAND.**—

“(A) **DATASET.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall create a common dataset of all locations in the United States where fixed broadband internet access service can be installed, as determined by the Commission.

“(ii) **CONTRACTING.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subclauses (II) and (III), the Commission may contract with an entity with expertise with respect to geographic information systems (referred to in this subsection as ‘GIS’) to create and maintain the dataset under clause (i).

“(II) **APPLICATION OF THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.**—A contract into which the

Commission enters under subclause (I) shall in all respects comply with applicable provisions of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(III) **LIMITATIONS.**—With respect to a contract into which the Commission enters under subclause (I)—

“(aa) the entity with which the Commission enters into the contract shall be selected through a competitive bid process that is transparent and open; and

“(bb) the contract shall be for a term of not longer than 5 years, after which the Commission may enter into a new contract—

“(AA) with an entity, and for the purposes, described in clause (i); and

“(BB) that complies with the requirements under subclause (II) and this subclause; and

“(cc) the contract shall—

“(AA) prohibit the entity described in item (aa) from selling, leasing, or otherwise disclosing for monetary consideration any personally identifiable information to any other entity other than for purposes authorized under this title; and

“(BB) require the entity described in item (aa) to include in any contract with any other entity a provision that prohibits that other entity from engaging in an action that is prohibited under subitem (AA).

“(B) **FABRIC.**—The rules issued by the Commission under subsection (a)(1) shall establish the Broadband Serviceable Location Fabric, which shall—

“(i) contain geocoded information for each location identified under subparagraph (A)(i);

“(ii) serve as the foundation upon which all data relating to the availability of fixed broadband internet access service collected under paragraph (2)(A) shall be reported and overlaid;

“(iii) be compatible with commonly used GIS software; and

“(iv) at a minimum, be updated every 6 months by the Commission.

“(C) **IMPLEMENTATION PRIORITY.**—The Commission shall prioritize implementing the Fabric for rural and insular areas of the United States.

“(2) **COLLECTION OF INFORMATION.**—The rules issued by the Commission under subsection (a)(1) shall include uniform standards for the reporting of broadband internet access service data that the Commission shall collect—

“(A) from each provider of terrestrial fixed, fixed wireless, or satellite broadband internet access service, which shall include data that—

“(i) documents the areas where the provider—

“(I) has actually built out the broadband network infrastructure of the provider such that the provider is able to provide that service; and

“(II) could provide that service, as determined by identifying where the provider is capable of performing a standard broadband installation, if applicable;

“(ii) includes information regarding download and upload speeds, at various thresholds established by the Commission, and, if applicable, latency with respect to broadband internet access service that the provider makes available;

“(iii) can be georeferenced to the GIS data in the Fabric;

“(iv) the provider shall report as—

“(I) with respect to providers of fixed wireless broadband internet access service—

“(aa) propagation maps and propagation model details that—

“(AA) satisfy standards that are similar to those applicable to providers of mobile broadband internet access service under subparagraph (B) with respect to propagation maps and propagation model details, taking into account material differences between

fixed wireless and mobile broadband internet access service; and

“(BB) reflect the speeds and latency of the service provided by the provider; or

“(bb) a list of addresses or locations that constitute the service area of the provider, except that the Commission—

“(AA) may only permit, and not require, a provider to report the data using that means of reporting; and

“(BB) in the rules issued under subsection (a)(1), shall provide a method for using that means of reporting with respect to Tribal areas; and

“(II) with respect to providers of terrestrial fixed and satellite broadband internet access service—

“(aa) polygon shapefiles; or

“(bb) a list of addresses or locations that constitute the service area of the provider, except that the Commission—

“(AA) may only permit, and not require, a provider to report the data using that means of reporting; and

“(BB) in the rules issued under subsection (a)(1), shall provide a method for using that means of reporting with respect to Tribal areas; and

“(v) the Commission determines is appropriate with respect to certain technologies in order to ensure that the Broadband Map is granular and accurate; and

“(B) from each provider of mobile broadband internet access service, which shall include propagation maps and propagation model details that indicate the current (as of the date on which the information is collected) fourth generation Long-Term Evolution (commonly referred to as ‘4G LTE’) mobile broadband internet access service coverage of the provider, which shall—

“(i) take into consideration the effect of clutter; and

“(ii) satisfy—

“(I) the requirements of having—

“(aa) a download speed of not less than 5 megabits per second and an upload speed of not less than 1 megabit per second with a cell edge probability of not less than 90 percent; and

“(bb) cell loading of not less than 50 percent; and

“(II) any other parameter that the Commission determines to be necessary to create a map under subsection (c)(1)(C) that is more precise than the map produced as a result of the submissions under the Mobility Fund Phase II information collection.

“(3) UPDATE OF REPORTING STANDARDS FOR MOBILE BROADBAND INTERNET ACCESS SERVICE.—For the purposes of paragraph (2)(B), if the Commission determines that the reporting standards under that paragraph are insufficient to collect accurate propagation maps and propagation model details with respect to future generations of mobile broadband internet access service technologies, the Commission shall immediately commence a rule making to adopt new reporting standards with respect to those technologies that—

“(A) shall be the functional equivalent of the standards required under paragraph (2)(B); and

“(B) allow for the collection of propagation maps and propagation model details that are as accurate and granular as, or more accurate and granular than, the maps and model details collected by the Commission under paragraph (2)(B).

“(4) CERTIFICATION AND VERIFICATION.—With respect to a provider that submits information to the Commission under paragraph (2)—

“(A) the provider shall include in each submission a certification from a corporate officer of the provider that the officer has examined the information contained in the sub-

mission and that, to the best of the officer’s actual knowledge, information, and belief, all statements of fact contained in the submission are true and correct; and

“(B) the Commission shall verify the accuracy and reliability of the information in accordance with measures established by the Commission.

“(5) CHALLENGE PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In the rules issued under subsection (a), and subject to subparagraph (B), the Commission shall establish a user-friendly challenge process through which consumers, State, local, and Tribal governmental entities, and other entities or individuals may submit coverage data to the Commission to challenge the accuracy of—

“(i) the coverage maps;

“(ii) any information submitted by a provider regarding the availability of broadband internet access service; or

“(iii) the information included in the Fabric.

“(B) CONSIDERATIONS; VERIFICATION; RESPONSE TO CHALLENGES.—In establishing the challenge process required under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

“(i) consider—

“(I) the types of information that an entity or individual submitting a challenge should provide to the Commission in support of the challenge;

“(II) the appropriate level of granularity for the information described in subclause (I);

“(III) the need to mitigate the time and expense incurred by, and the administrative burdens placed on, entities or individuals in—

“(aa) challenging the accuracy of a coverage map; and

“(bb) responding to challenges described in item (aa);

“(IV) the costs to consumers and providers resulting from a misallocation of funds because of a reliance on outdated or otherwise inaccurate information in the coverage maps;

“(V) any lessons learned from the challenge process established under Mobility Fund Phase II, as determined from comments solicited by the Commission; and

“(VI) the need for user-friendly challenge submission formats that will promote participation in the challenge process;

“(i) include a process for verifying the data submitted through the challenge process in order to ensure the reliability of that data;

“(iii) allow providers to respond to challenges submitted through the challenge process; and

“(iv) develop an online mechanism, which—

“(I) shall be integrated into the coverage maps;

“(II) allows for an entity described in subparagraph (A) to submit a challenge under the challenge process;

“(III) makes challenge data available in both geographic information system and non-geographic information system formats; and

“(IV) clearly identifies the areas in which broadband internet access service is available, and the upload and download speeds at which that service is available, as reported to the Commission under this section.

“(C) USE OF CHALLENGES.—The rules issued to establish the challenge process under subparagraph (A) shall include—

“(i) a process for the speedy resolution of challenges; and

“(ii) a process for the regular and expeditious updating of the coverage maps and granular data disseminated by the Commission as challenges are resolved.

“(D) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not earlier than 1 year, and not later than 18 months, after the date on which the rules issued under subsection (a)(1) take effect, the Commission shall, after an opportunity for notice and comment, submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that—

“(i) evaluates the challenge process described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) considers whether the Commission should commence an inquiry on the need for other tools to help—

“(I) identify potential inaccuracies in the data relating to broadband internet access service that providers report; and

“(II) improve the accuracy of the data described in subclause (I).

“(6) REFORM OF FORM 477 PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the rules issued under subsection (a) take effect, the Commission shall—

“(i) reform the Form 477 broadband deployment service availability collection process of the Commission—

“(I) to achieve the purposes of this title; and

“(II) in a manner that—

“(aa) enables the comparison of data and maps produced before the implementation of this title with data and coverage maps produced after the implementation of this title; and

“(bb) maintains the public availability of data relating to the deployment of broadband internet access service; and

“(ii) harmonize reporting requirements and procedures regarding the deployment of broadband internet access service that are in effect on the day before the date on which the rules issued under subsection (a)(1) take effect with those requirements and procedures in those rules.

“(B) CONTINUED COLLECTION AND REPORTING.—On and after the date on which the Commission carries out subparagraph (A), the Commission shall continue to collect and publicly report subscription data that the Commission collected through the Form 477 broadband deployment service availability process, as in effect on July 1, 2019.

“(7) SHARING DATA WITH NTIA.—The Commission shall establish a process to make the data collected under paragraph (2) available to the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

“(c) MAPS.—The Commission shall—

“(1) after consultation with the Federal Geographic Data Committee established under section 753(a) of the Geospatial Data Act of 2018, create—

“(A) the Broadband Map, which shall depict—

“(i) the extent of the availability of broadband internet access service in the United States, without regard to whether that service is fixed broadband internet access service or mobile broadband internet access service, which shall be based on data collected by the Commission from all providers; and

“(ii) the areas of the United States that remain unserved by providers;

“(B) a map that depicts the availability of fixed broadband internet access service, which shall be based on data collected by the Commission from providers under subsection (b)(2)(A); and

“(C) a map that depicts the availability of mobile broadband internet access service, which shall be based on data collected by the Commission from providers under subsection (b)(2)(B);

“(2) use the maps created under paragraph (1)—

“(A) to determine the areas in which terrestrial fixed, fixed wireless, mobile, and satellite broadband internet access service is and is not available; and

“(B) when making any new award of funding with respect to the deployment of broadband internet access service;

“(3) update the maps created under paragraph (1) not less frequently than biannually using the most recent data collected from providers under subsection (b)(2);

“(4) consult with—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to consult the maps created under paragraph (1) when considering the awarding of funds for the deployment of broadband internet access service under any program administered by the Administrator of the Rural Utilities Service; and

“(B) the National Telecommunications and Information Administration to enable the Administration to consult the maps created under paragraph (1) when considering the awarding of funds for the deployment of broadband internet access service under any future program administered by the Administration;

“(5) make available to any Federal agency, upon request, the maps created under paragraph (1); and

“(6) make public at an appropriate level of granularity—

“(A) the maps created under paragraph (1); and

“(B) the data collected by the Commission with respect to the availability of broadband internet access service and the quality of service with respect to broadband internet access service.

“(d) **DELAYED EFFECTIVE DATE FOR QUALITY OF SERVICE RULES.**—Any requirement of a rule issued under subsection (a)(1) that relates to quality of service shall take effect not earlier than the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Commission issues that rule.

“SEC. 803. ENFORCEMENT.

“It shall be unlawful for an entity or individual to willfully and knowingly, or recklessly, submit information or data under this title that is materially inaccurate or incomplete with respect to the availability of broadband internet access service or the quality of service with respect to broadband internet access service.

“SEC. 804. IMPROVING DATA ACCURACY.

“(a) **AUDITS.**—The Commission shall conduct regular audits of information submitted to the Commission by providers under section 802(b)(2) to ensure that the providers are complying with this title.

“(b) **CROWDSOURCING.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall develop a process through which entities or individuals in the United States may submit specific information about the deployment and availability of broadband internet access service in the United States on an ongoing basis so that the information may be used to verify and supplement information provided by providers of broadband internet access service for inclusion in the maps created under section 802(c)(1).

“(2) **COLLABORATION.**—As part of the efforts of the Commission to facilitate the ability of entities and individuals to submit information under paragraph (1), the Commission shall—

“(A) prioritize the consideration of data provided by data collection applications used by consumers that the Commission has determined—

“(i) are highly reliable; and

“(ii) have proven methodologies for determining network coverage and network performance;

“(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, conclude a process that tests the feasibility of partnering with Federal agencies that operate delivery fleet vehicles, including the United States Postal Service, to facilitate the collection and submission of information described in that paragraph; and

“(C) not later than 14 months after the date of enactment of this title, publish on the website of the Commission, and submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, a report regarding the testing described in subparagraph (B), which shall include—

“(i) a determination regarding whether the partnerships with Federal agencies described in that subparagraph are able to facilitate the collection and submission of information described in paragraph (1); and

“(ii) any steps that the Commission plans to take to facilitate the partnerships described in that subparagraph.

“(c) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO INDIAN TRIBES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the Commission shall hold workshops for Tribal governments in each of the 12 Bureau of Indian Affairs regions to provide technical assistance with the collection and submission of data under section 802(a)(2).

“(2) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—Each year, the Commission, in consultation with Indian Tribes, shall review the need for continued workshops required under paragraph (1).

“(d) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SMALL SERVICE PROVIDERS.**—The Commission shall establish a process through which a provider that has fewer than 100,000 active broadband internet access service connections may request and receive assistance from the Commission with respect to geographic information system data processing to ensure that the provider is able to comply with the requirements under section 802(b) in a timely and accurate manner.

“(e) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE, LOCAL, AND TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS AND CONSUMERS.**—The Commission shall provide technical assistance to consumers and State, local, and Tribal governmental entities with respect to the challenge process established under section 802(b)(5), which shall include—

“(1) detailed tutorials and webinars; and

“(2) the provision of staff of the Commission to provide assistance, as needed, throughout the entirety of the challenge process.

“(f) **GAO ASSESSMENT OF FABRIC SOURCE DATA.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an assessment of key data sources that are used for purposes of the Fabric to identify and geocode locations where fixed broadband internet access service can be installed in order for the Comptroller General to develop recommendations for how the quality and completeness of those data sources can be improved as data sources for the Fabric.

“(2) **SOURCES INCLUDED.**—For the purposes of the assessment conducted under paragraph (1), the key data sources described in that paragraph shall include—

“(A) any relevant sources of Federal data, including the National Address Database administered by the Department of Transportation;

“(B) State- and county-level digitized parcel data; and

“(C) property tax attribute recording.

“(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this title, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the

Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that contains the recommendations developed under paragraph (1).

“SEC. 805. COST.

“(a) **USF.**—The Commission may not use funds from the universal service programs of the Commission established under section 254, and the regulations issued under that section, to pay for any costs associated with this title.

“(b) **OTHER FUNDS.**—The Commission may recover costs associated with this title under section 9 to the extent provided for in an appropriation Act, as required under subsection (a) of that section.

“SEC. 806. OTHER PROVISIONS.

“(a) **OMB.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the initial rule making required under section 802(a)(1) shall be exempt from review by the Office of Management and Budget.

“(b) **PRA.**—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Paperwork Reduction Act’) shall not apply to the initial rule making required under section 802(a)(1).

“(c) **EXECUTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.**—Except as provided in section 802(b)(1)(A)(ii), the Commission—

“(1) including the offices of the Commission, shall carry out the responsibilities assigned to the Commission under this title; and

“(2) may not delegate any of the responsibilities assigned to the Commission under this title to any third party, including the Universal Service Administrative Company.

“(d) **REPORTING.**—Each fiscal year, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report that summarizes the implementation of this title and associated enforcement activities conducted during the previous fiscal year.

“(e) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—If the Commission, before the date of enactment of this title, has taken an action that, in whole or in part, implements this title, the Commission shall not be required to revisit such action to the extent that such action is consistent with this title.”.

SA 1269. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. PORTMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1434, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, strike “, in whole or in part, based” and insert “is solely based”.

SA 1270. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 439, to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Members of Congress Pension Opt Out Clarification Act”.

SA 1271. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 221, to amend title 38, United

States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Provider Accountability Act”.

SEC. 2. ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REPORTING MAJOR ADVERSE ACTIONS TO NATIONAL PRACTITIONER DATA BANK AND STATE LICENSING BOARDS.—Section 7461 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Whenever the Under Secretary for Health (or an official designated by the Under Secretary) brings charges based on conduct or performance against a section 7401(1) employee and as a result of those charges a covered major adverse action is taken against the employee, the Under Secretary shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which such covered major adverse action is carried out—

“(A) transmit to the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services and the applicable State licensing board the name of the employee, a description of the covered major adverse action, and a description of the reason for the covered major adverse action; and

“(B) update the VetPro System, or successor system, with a record of the covered major adverse action taken and an indication that information was transmitted under subparagraph (A).

“(2) The Under Secretary for Health—

“(A) shall enroll all 7401(1) employees in a continuous query of their record within the National Practitioner Data Bank; and

“(B) shall develop and implement a mechanism for maintaining and updating the information collected through such continuous query within the VetPro System, or successor system, to facilitate the sharing of such information between Veterans Integrated Service Networks.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘covered major adverse action’ means a major adverse action with respect to a section 7401(1) employee that originated from circumstances in which the behavior of the employee so substantially failed to meet generally-accepted standards of clinical practice as to raise reasonable concern for safety of patients.”.

(b) PROHIBITION ON SIGNING SETTLEMENTS WITH CERTAIN CLAUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not enter into a settlement agreement relating to an adverse action against a section 7401(1) employee under which the Department of Veterans Affairs would be required to conceal a serious medical error or a lapse in generally-accepted standards of clinical practice.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a negative record if the head of the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection of the Department and the Special Counsel (established by section 1211 of title 5, United States Code) jointly certify that the negative record is not legitimate.

(c) TRAINING ON CREDENTIALING AND PRIVILEGING.—The Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall provide to all staff of the Veterans Health Administration who handle hiring, privi-

leging, and credentialing mandatory training on—

(1) all policies of the Veterans Health Administration for credentialing and privileging; and

(2) when and how to report adverse actions to the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services, State licensing boards, and other relevant entities.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UPDATES TO THE VHA HANDBOOK.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress recognizes that the confusion regarding practices in the Veterans Health Administration for reporting to State licensing boards stems from a lack of guidance in the Veterans Health Administration handbook 1100.18;

(2) Congress strongly recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs update such handbook to ensure that employees of the Veterans Health Administration, officials of the Veterans Integrated Services Networks, and officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs understand and are able to utilize the role of State licensing boards to effectively prevent instances of failed reporting and future patient safety concerns;

(3) Congress recognizes the broad authority of the Veterans Health Administration to report to State licensing boards those employed or separated health care professionals whose behavior and clinical practice so substantially failed to meet generally-accepted standards of clinical practice as to raise reasonable concern for safety of patients and requests that such handbook is updated to reflect appropriate reporting channels to ensure employee understanding of those procedures and authorities; and

(4) in developing the new handbook, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs should consult with—

(A) State licensing boards;

(B) the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

(C) the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(D) the exclusive representative of section 7401(1) employees.

(e) SECTION 7401(1) EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “section 7401(1) employee” has the meaning given that term in section 7461(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1272. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BOOZMAN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2096, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize States and tribal organizations that receive grants from the National Cemetery Administration for establishment, expansion, or improvement of a veterans’ cemeteries to use amounts of such grants for State and tribal organization cemetery personnel to train at the training center of the National Cemetery Administration, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TRAINING OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERY PERSONNEL BY NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION.

Section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “and (ii) the cost” and inserting “(ii) the cost”; and

(ii) by inserting “; and (iii) training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the Na-

tional Cemetery Administration” before the semicolon; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “and (ii) the cost” and inserting “(ii) the cost”; and

(ii) by inserting “; and (iii) training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration” before the period;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) A grant under this section for a purpose described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) may be used, solely or in part, for training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration.”.

SA 1273. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. CRUZ)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 550, to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) 2019 marked the 74th anniversary of Allied victory in World War II.

(2) The United States Merchant Marine (in this section referred to as the “Merchant Marine”) was integral in providing the link between domestic production and the fighting forces overseas, providing combat equipment, fuel, food, commodities, and raw materials to troops stationed abroad.

(3) Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King acknowledged the indispensability of the Merchant Marine to the victory in a 1945 letter stating that, without the support of the Merchant Marine, “the Navy could not have accomplished its mission”.

(4) President, and former Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces, Dwight D. Eisenhower acknowledged that “through the prompt delivery of supplies and equipment to our armed forces overseas, and of cargoes representing economic and military aid to friendly nations, the American Merchant Marine has effectively helped to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world”.

(5) Military missions and war planning were contingent upon the availability of resources and the Merchant Marine played a vital role in this regard, ensuring the efficient and reliable transoceanic transport of military equipment and both military and civilian personnel.

(6) The Merchant Marine provided for the successful transport of resources and personnel despite consistent and ongoing exposure to enemy combatants from both the air and the sea, including from enemy bomber squadrons, submarines, and naval mines.

(7) The efforts of the Merchant Marine were not without sacrifices as the Merchant Marine likely bore a higher per-capita casualty rate than any of the military branches during the war.

(8) The Merchant Marine proved to be an instrumental asset on an untold number of

occasions, participating in every landing operation by the United States Marine Corps, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa.

(9) The Merchant Marine provided the bulk tonnage of material necessary for the invasion of Normandy, an invasion which, according to a 1944 New York Times article, "would not have been possible without the Merchant Marine".

(10) In assessing the performance of the Merchant Marine, General Eisenhower stated, "every man in this Allied command is quick to express his admiration for the loyalty, courage, and fortitude of the officers and men of the Merchant Marine. We count upon their efficiency and their utter devotion to duty as we do our own; they have never failed us".

(11) During a September 1944 speech, President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that the Merchant Marine had "delivered the goods when and where needed in every theater of operations and across every ocean in the biggest, the most difficult, and dangerous transportation job ever undertaken. As time goes on, there will be greater public understanding of our merchant fleet's record during this war".

(12) The feats and accomplishments of the Merchant Marine are deserving of broader public recognition.

(13) The United States will be forever grateful and indebted to these merchant mariners for their effective, reliable, and courageous transport of goods and resources in enemy territory throughout theaters of every variety in World War II.

(14) The goods and resources transported by the Merchant Marine saved thousands of lives and enabled the Allied Powers to claim victory in World War II.

(15) The Congressional Gold Medal would be an appropriate way to shed further light on the service of the merchant mariners in World War II and the instrumental role they played in winning that war.

(16) Many students of the Merchant Marine Academy lost their lives as they sailed through enemy-controlled waters or unloaded cargo in overseas combat areas, and, as a result, the United States Merchant Marine Academy is the only institution among the 5 Federal academies to be authorized to carry a battle standard as part of its color guard.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE MUSEUM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal under subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the American Merchant Marine Museum, where it will be available for display as appropriate and available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the American Merchant Marine Museum should make the gold medal given to the Museum under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at appropriate locations associated with the United States Merchant Marine and that

preference should be given to locations affiliated with the United States Merchant Marine.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 3, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SA 1274. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1029, to allow the use of certified facility dogs in criminal proceedings in Federal courts, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Courthouse Dogs Act".

SEC. 2. USE OF CERTIFIED FACILITY DOG FOR TESTIMONY IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3502 the following:

"§ 3503. Use of certified facility dog for testimony in criminal proceedings

"(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term 'certified facility dog' means a dog that has graduated from an assistance dog organization that is a member of an internationally recognized assistance dog association that has a primary purpose of granting accreditation based on standards of excellence in areas of—

- "(1) assistance dog acquisition;
- "(2) dog training;
- "(3) dog handler training; and
- "(4) dog placement.

"(b) REQUESTS FOR USE OF CERTIFIED FACILITY DOGS.—Either party in a criminal proceeding in a Federal court may apply for an order from the court to allow a certified facility dog, if available, to be present with a witness testifying before the court through—

- "(1) in-person testimony; or
- "(2) testimony televised by 2-way, closed-circuit television.

"(c) CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL.—A Federal court may enter an order authorizing an available certified facility dog to accompany a witness while testifying at a hearing in accordance with subsection (b) if the court finds that—

- "(1) the dog to be used qualifies as a certified facility dog;
- "(2) the use of a certified facility dog will aid the witness in providing testimony; and
- "(3) upon a showing by the party seeking an order under subsection (b), the certified facility dog is insured for liability protection.

"(d) HANDLERS.—Each certified facility dog authorized to accompany a witness under subsection (c) shall be accompanied by a handler who is—

- "(1) trained to manage the certified facility dog by an assistance dog organization described in subsection (a); and
- "(2) a professional working in the legal system with knowledge about the legal and criminal justice processes.

"(e) DEADLINE.—The party seeking an order under subsection (b) shall apply for

such order not later than 14 days before the preliminary hearing, trial date, or other hearing to which the order is to apply.

"(f) OTHER ORDERS.—A Federal court may make such orders as may be necessary to preserve the fairness of the proceeding, including imposing restrictions on, and instructing the jury regarding, the presence of the certified facility dog during the proceedings.

"(g) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent a Federal court from providing any other accommodations to a witness in accordance with applicable law."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The chapter analysis for chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3502 the following:

"3503. Use of certified facility dog for testimony in criminal proceedings."

SA 1275. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CARDIN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1309, to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to assess United States assistance to designated countries in order to advance anti-corruption efforts in those countries and better serve United States taxpayers; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to help foreign countries promote good governance and combat public corruption;

(2) multiple Federal departments and agencies operate programs that promote good governance in foreign countries and enhance such countries' ability to combat public corruption; and

(3) the Department of State should—

(A) promote coordination among the Federal departments and agencies implementing programs to promote good governance and combat public corruption in foreign countries in order to improve effectiveness and efficiency; and

(B) identify areas in which United States efforts to help other countries promote good governance and combat public corruption could be enhanced.

SEC. 2. ANNUAL ASSESSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of the fiscal years 2020 through 2026, the Secretary of State shall assess the capacity and commitment of foreign governments to which the United States provides foreign assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) or the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.) to combat public corruption. Each such assessment shall—

(1) utilize independent, third party indicators that measure transparency, accountability, and corruption in the public sector in such countries, including the extent to which public power is exercised for private gain, to identify those countries that are most vulnerable to public corruption;

(2) consider, to the extent reliable information is available, whether the government of a country identified under paragraph (1)—

(A) has adopted measures to prevent public corruption, such as measures to inform and educate the public, including potential victims, about the causes and consequences of public corruption;

(B) has enacted laws and established government structures, policies, and practices that prohibit public corruption;

(C) enforces such laws through a fair judicial process;

(D) vigorously investigates, prosecutes, convicts, and sentences public officials who participate in or facilitate public corruption, including nationals of such country who are deployed in foreign military assignments, trade delegations abroad, or other similar missions who engage in or facilitate public corruption;

(E) prescribes appropriate punishment for serious, significant corruption that is commensurate with the punishment prescribed for serious crimes;

(F) prescribes appropriate punishment for significant corruption that provides a sufficiently stringent deterrent and adequately reflects the nature of the offense;

(G) convicts and sentences persons responsible for such acts that take place wholly or partly within the country of such government, including, as appropriate, requiring the incarceration of individuals convicted of such acts;

(H) holds private sector representatives accountable for their role in public corruption; and

(I) addresses threats for civil society to monitor anti-corruption efforts; and

(3) further consider—

(A) verifiable measures taken by the government of a country identified under paragraph (1) to prohibit government officials from participating in, facilitating, or condoning public corruption, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of such officials;

(B) the extent to which such government provides access, or, as appropriate, makes adequate resources available, to civil society organizations and other institutions to combat public corruption, including reporting, investigating, and monitoring;

(C) the extent to which an independent judiciary or judicial body in such country is responsible for, and effectively capable of, deciding public corruption cases impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with law, without any improper restrictions, influences, inducements, pressures, threats, or interferences, whether direct or indirect, from any source or for any reason;

(D) the extent to which such government cooperates meaningfully with the United States to strengthen government and judicial institutions and the rule of law to prevent, prohibit, and punish public corruption;

(E) the extent to which such government—

(i) is assisting in international investigations of transnational public corruption networks and in other cooperative efforts to combat serious, significant corruption, including cooperating with the governments of other countries to extradite corrupt actors;

(ii) recognizes the rights of victims of public corruption, ensures their access to justice, and takes steps to prevent such victims from being further victimized or persecuted by corrupt actors, government officials, or others; and

(iii) refrains from prosecuting legitimate victims of public corruption or whistleblowers due to such persons having assisted in exposing public corruption, and refrains from other discriminatory treatment of such persons; and

(F) contain such other information relating to public corruption as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

(b) IDENTIFICATION.—After conducting each assessment under subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall identify, of the countries described in subsection (a)(1)—

(1) which countries are meeting minimum standards to combat public corruption;

(2) which countries are not meeting such minimum standards, but are making significant efforts to do so; and

(3) which countries are not meeting such minimum standards and are not making significant efforts to do so.

(c) REPORT.—Except as provided in subsection (d), not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through fiscal year 2026, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees, and make such report publicly available. Such report shall—

(1) identify the countries described in subsection (a)(1) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b);

(2) describe the methodology and data utilized in the assessments under subsection (a); and

(3) identify the reasons for the identifications referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) BRIEFING IN LIEU OF REPORT.—The Secretary of State may waive the requirement to submit and make publicly available a written report under subsection (c) if the Secretary—

(1) determines that publication of such report would—

(A) undermine existing United States anti-corruption efforts in 1 or more countries; or

(B) threaten the national interests of the United States; and

(2) provides a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) identifies the countries described in subsection (a)(1) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (b);

(B) describes the methodology and data utilized in the assessment under subsection (a); and

(C) identifies the reasons for such identifications.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(3) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

For each country identified under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(b), the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, as appropriate, shall—

(1) ensure that a corruption risk assessment and mitigation strategy is included in the integrated country strategy for such country; and

(2) utilize appropriate mechanisms to combat corruption in such countries, including by ensuring—

(A) the inclusion of anti-corruption clauses in contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements entered into by the Department of State or the United States Agency for International Development for or in such countries, which allow for the termination of such contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements, as the case may be, without penalty if credible indicators of public corruption are discovered;

(B) the inclusion of appropriate clawback or flowdown clauses within the procurement instruments of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development that provide for the recovery of funds misappropriated through corruption;

(C) the appropriate disclosure to the United States Government, in confidential

form, if necessary, of the beneficial ownership of contractors, subcontractors, grantees, cooperative agreement participants, and other organizations implementing programs on behalf of the Department of State or the United States Agency for International Development; and

(D) the establishment of mechanisms for investigating allegations of misappropriated resources and equipment.

SEC. 4. DESIGNATION OF EMBASSY ANTI-CORRUPTION POINTS OF CONTACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall annually designate an anti-corruption point of contact at the United States diplomatic post to each country identified under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 2(b), or which the Secretary otherwise determines is in need of such a point of contact. The point of contact shall be the Chief of Mission or the Chief of Mission's designee.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each anti-corruption point of contact designated under subsection (a) shall be responsible for coordinating and overseeing the implementation of a whole-of-government approach among the relevant Federal departments and agencies operating programs that—

(1) promote good governance in foreign countries; and

(2) enhance the ability of such countries—

(A) to combat public corruption; and

(B) to develop and implement corruption risk assessment tools and mitigation strategies.

(c) TRAINING.—The Secretary of State shall implement appropriate training for anti-corruption points of contact designated under subsection (a).

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CORRUPT ACTOR.—The term “corrupt actor” means—

(A) any foreign person or entity that is a government official or government entity responsible for, or complicit in, an act of public corruption; and

(B) any company, in which a person or entity described in subparagraph (A) has a significant stake, which is responsible for, or complicit in, an act of public corruption.

(2) FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.—The term “foreign assistance” means assistance made available under—

(A) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.); or

(B) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).

(3) GRAND CORRUPTION.—The term “grand corruption” means public corruption committed at a high level of government that—

(A) distorts policies or the central functioning of the country; and

(B) enables leaders to benefit at the expense of the public good.

(4) PETTY CORRUPTION.—The term “petty corruption” means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain by low- or mid-level public officials in their interactions with ordinary citizens, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

(5) PUBLIC CORRUPTION.—The term “public corruption” means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a request for one committee to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, December 19, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Virginia Flores, a detailee of the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, be granted floor privileges for the debate and action on H.R. 1158 and H.R. 1865.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD THUNE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in 1906, two brothers named Nikolai and Matthew Gjelsvik arrived at Ellis Island from Norway. The only English they knew were the words "apple pie" and "coffee," which evidently they learned on the boat on the way over.

The immigration officials at Ellis Island thought that their name would be too difficult to spell and pronounce in this country, so they asked them to change their name. The names, when they got to this country, were Nikolai Gjelsvik, spelled G-J-E-L-S-V-I-K, and his brother was named Matthew.

So the immigration officials asked them to change their name, and they picked the name from the farm where they worked near Bergen, Norway, which was called the Thune farm. So Nikolai Gjelsvik became Nick Thune, my grandfather.

He and his brother worked on the railroad as they built it west across South Dakota. They learned English and saved up enough money to start a small merchandising company and then later a hardware store in Mitchell, SD. To this day, there is a Thune Hardware in Mitchell, although the family sold it many years ago.

In 1916, Nick Thune married an Iowa girl who had moved to South Dakota to teach school, and they had three sons. The middle son, Harold, will turn 100 in a few days, and that middle son happens to be my dad.

Like many of my colleagues, I send congratulatory notes to constituents for big birthdays and anniversaries. I never thought I would have the occasion to send one to my dad. I figured for this one, instead of writing a letter, I would come to the floor.

My dad is a World War II veteran. He is a member of that "greatest generation," and he shares the qualities of so many in that generation—humility, patriotism, quiet service. Dad was a Navy pilot who flew Hellcats off the USS *In-*

trepid, and he was an excellent pilot. He received the Distinguished Flying Cross for shooting down four enemy planes in one engagement. As a side note to that, that accommodation was issued to him by none other than ADM John McCain, Senator John McCain's grandfather.

But my dad didn't and still doesn't talk about his own exploits. In fact, had it not been for my mom, I am quite sure I never would have known about my dad's record in World War II. I did have the opportunity to interview him for the Library of Congress's Veterans History Project a few years back, and he shared some wonderful details about his service. As usual, his focus was never on his own achievements but on those of his fellow pilots.

I also probably would never have learned what an outstanding athlete my dad was, had it not been for my mom. My dad grew up in the small town of Murdo, SD, during the Great Depression. They didn't have a lot, but there were a lot of basketball hoops around Murdo. They put them on barns, poles, garages, and my dad learned to play. In fact, he learned to play so well that he took his high school basketball team to the State championship game where, although they lost narrowly, he was named the tournament's most valuable player.

My dad had hoped to attend college in South Dakota, but there was a doctor in Murdo named Joseph Murphy who thought my dad was good enough to play at the University of Minnesota and used his contacts to get my dad up to Hibbing Junior College in hopes that the Minnesota Gophers would notice him. Well, they did. He went to the Twin Cities on a scholarship and played three seasons for the Gophers. He was the team's most valuable player in his junior year. In fact, he was high point man in Madison Square Garden on his birthday, December 28, 1940.

In another example of how things have changed through the years, my dad said that when his team came out to play for the second game that night at the Garden, you couldn't see the upper deck because of all the cigarette smoke. Some things do change for the better.

While at the University of Minnesota, my dad met a girl who served sodas at a drugstore just off campus. They were married within a couple of years while my dad was in flight training for the Navy, and they spent the next almost 69 years together.

After the war, they came back to South Dakota. My dad had been thinking about a career in the Navy, but his dad asked him to come back and run the family hardware store. My dad said that his heart sank, but he knew that is what he had to do. So he went home and went to work for his dad. The hardware store did OK for a while, but started to struggle. My dad sold it and went back to school and got a teaching degree.

All parents are teachers for their kids, but my parents were teachers sev-

eral times over. Kids usually get a break from their parents when they are at school. My dad was a teacher at my high school. He was also a coach and the athletic director, and he drove the bus. My mom was the school librarian. So I think it is safe to say that my brothers and sister and I were pretty much always under the watchful eye of my parents. I have to say that I never had my dad for a class in high school, but my brother Rich did. Rich was the valedictorian of his high school class, and the only B he got in high school was from my dad. That was my dad for you. He never showed any preference or gave any of his kids better treatment than anybody else. In fact, some of us might argue that he gave us a harder time because we were his kids. But he believed very firmly that you had to earn your achievements.

As a coach, my dad taught us about being a team player. He made it clear that being on a team was not about building your personal statistics but about making the players around you better. It is a lesson I have carried throughout my life and one that I try to live by every day.

A few years ago, the Jones County School District in Murdo named the auditorium in Murdo after my dad in recognition of his service and achievements at the school. It was particularly special since my dad was one of the volunteers who originally built the auditorium back in the 1950s. My dad would tell me the story that he was more scared up on the scaffolding of that building than he had ever been flying off a carrier during World War II.

You might think that with my dad as coach and athletic director, sports were the main focus around our house. They certainly were a big part of our lives. But my mom was determined that we would grow up to be well-rounded people, and my dad always supported her in that. They worked hard to ensure that we grew up with a perspective on life that went beyond just the latest sporting event. Mom made us take piano lessons and, during the summers, come in from outside and read for an hour every day. We complained at the time, but I know all of us today are grateful to her and my father for their investments in that.

Mom and Dad made a good team. Mom was an optimist, and Dad was a pessimist—or, as he would put it, a realist—and they balanced each other out well. We didn't have material riches growing up, but we were beyond rich in those things that money can't buy but that lend purpose, joy, and meaning to life. All of us Thune kids are very, very grateful for that heritage.

I can't close without talking about something that was life-changing for my parents, and that was their strong faith in Christ. My dad always had real discernment and wisdom in no small part because of his daily dependence upon God in his life. God blessed him with it.

As we celebrate my dad's 100th birthday, I want to say thank you to you for the example of faith, integrity, character, and humility that you have given to me and to Bob and to Rich and to Karen and to Tim. Thank you for faithfully serving God's purpose for your generation and happy 100th birthday.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM EBELTOFT

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we have had a fruitful day here today. We passed a lot of bills. We did it in a bipartisan way. I want to thank both Leader MCCONNELL and Leader SCHUMER for their good work, as well as Chairman SHELBY and Ranking Member LEAHY for their good work on these bills.

Today, I am going to do something that I have never done before. I am going to read an obituary about a man I don't believe I have ever met, even though I was in the Veterans' Home of Columbia Falls while he was there. This obituary was passed on to me by my wife, who got it from a friend. It is incredibly powerful because, quite frankly, it is about one man, but it is actually about a generation of men and women who served in Vietnam.

This guy's name was William Ebeltoft. The obituary goes like this:

"Not everyone who lost his life in Vietnam died there." The saying is true for CW2 William C. Ebeltoft. He died on December 15, 2019 at the Veteran's Home in Columbia Falls, Montana. He died 50 years after he lost, in Vietnam, all that underpinned his life. He was 73 years old.

Everyone called him "Bill." He was loved by the nursing staff who cared for him. He was loved by the fellow veterans with whom he lived; those he helped when he was able and entertained with funny German slang and a stint at the piano when he could. He was a virtuoso when playing "Waltzing Matilda."

His small family loved him dearly. He was preceded in death by his parents, Paul and Mary Ebeltoft of Dickinson, North Dakota, whose devotion and care for their war-damaged boy was strong and unflinching. He is survived by his brother, Paul Ebeltoft, and the one he loved as the sister he never had, Paul's wife, Gail. . . . It is difficult to write about Bill. He lived three lives: before, during and after Vietnam. Before Vietnam, Bill was a handsome man, who wore clothing well; a man with white, straight teeth that shined in his ready smile. A state champion trap shooter, a low handicap golfer, a 218-average bowler, a man of quick, earthy wit, with a fondness for children, old men, hunting, fast cars, and a cold Schlitz. He told jokes well.

During Vietnam, he lived with horrors of which he would only seldom speak. Slow Motion Four, Bill's personal call sign, logged thousands of helicopter flight hours performing Forward Support Base resupply landings, medical evacuations, exfiles and gun ship runs. We know of him there mostly through medals for valor he received, and these were many. . . . While attempting to resupply B Company, [Warrant Officer]

Ebeltoft's co-pilot became wounded. Realizing the importance of the mission WO Ebeltoft elected to attempt completion of the mission. Due to his superior knowledge of the aircraft, the helicopter was kept under control during the period in which the pilot was wounded and the ship was under fire. Remaining under attack from automatic weapons fire, the supply mission was successfully completed. While unloading the supplies, WO Ebeltoft received word that there were five emergency medical evacuation cases located 200 meters to his rear. WO Ebeltoft repositioned his helicopter and picked up the wounded personnel. While evacuating the wounded, the commanding officer of Company B was injured. WO Ebeltoft again maneuvered his aircraft to enable evacuation of the injured officer. WO Ebeltoft then proceeded to evacuate all injured personnel by the fastest possible means. Upon completion, examination of the aircraft revealed that the aircraft had sustained nine enemy .30 caliber hits.

Bill got the medal, of course, but he would have been the last to say anything about it. The citation shows the type of man that he, and many of his brothers-in-arms in Vietnam were; and still are today, albeit battered hard and unfairly by the cruel winds of the time in which they fought.

After being discharged as a decorated hero, Bill had a rough re-entry into civilian life. It is not necessary to recount Bill's portion of what is an all-too-common story for wartime veterans, particularly those of the Vietnam era. It may be sufficient to say that after a run at business, a marriage and while grappling daily with his demons, his mental faculties escaped him. Bill became a resident of the Veteran's Home in Columbia Falls, Montana in 1994. He lived there for the next 26 years.

At the Home, the patina of his memory covered life's sorrows, and it was a blessing. Bill was happy there, living a life that was a strange mixture of hunting stories, pickup trucks and memories of some of his better times with women, friends and the outdoor life. Bill denied that anyone he loved had died; could not understand why anyone would fill with gas at four bucks a gallon when "Johnny's Standard sells it for 27 cents;" and still "drove" his 1968 Dodge Charger. He was unfailingly courteous. His largest concerns were making his smoke breaks and finding his wallet (a search of 26 years.)

In the past year, Bill's shaky grip on physical health also slipped through his fingers. Yet, despite this, what we loved in him remained, if only sometimes as a shadow. Even after his serious decline, suffering fractures because of falls, Bill would tell the staff that he was "just fine" and not to worry about him. Thin, hunched over, propelling himself with one foot, he would wheel himself into the room of a bed-ridden veteran and sit there, next to the bed, unspeaking. The nursing staff was certain that Bill thought that the man in bed was lonely and needed company.

Bill was always a proud man, remembering himself as he was in 1969, not as he became. Who are we to suggest differently? His was not a life that many would wish for, but in some ways, Bill was a lucky man. He was surrounded to the end by staff who enjoyed and respected him. He had a chance to be helpful to others who were doing less well than he. And the passing of the seasons never diminished his plans for another elk hunt or to "see that beautiful girl again this weekend."

When a small slice of reality penetrated his pleasant confusion, Bill struggled to understand why he was where he was. Prematurely aged, his worldly goods in a small

dresser, not knowing who the President might be or remembering why he should care, Bill's losses were greater than most of us could endure. Yet, to those who love him, his brother and his brother's wife, and their sons, he will always be a brave, accomplished man, more generous than was wise, more trusting than was safe.

It is not possible to wrap your arms around a loved one who leaves. But it is possible to wrap your heart around a memory. Bill's will be well taken care of.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor again for the third time in 3 weeks to talk about the U.S.-Mexico agreement, USMCA.

Just a few moments ago, this trade agreement passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 385 to 41. That is extraordinary. Trade agreements sometimes tend to be pretty controversial and, more recently in our history, pretty partisan. In this case, Republicans and Democrats alike helped negotiate a good agreement, and Republicans and Democrats alike supported it.

Let's now get that agreement over here. Let's not wait. The people in Ohio and all around in country who are going to benefit from it need those benefits now.

So I am very pleased that the President and his U.S. Trade Representative, Bob Lighthizer, patiently negotiated with Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats and were able to get something done, and now it is close to becoming the law of the land. All it needs is a vote over here from the Senate and then the President will sign it into law.

Thanks to important measures designed to strengthen our economy, create more jobs, and increase market access, this new agreement, the USMCA, actually helps to level the playing field between the United States and Canada and Mexico.

First of all, it is going to result in more jobs. The independent International Trade Commission has said over 170,000 new jobs. That is mid-range. It could be a lot more than that.

But they have also said that these are good-paying jobs. Jobs in trade tend to pay about 15 percent higher on average, and they have better benefits. So this is a bunch of good jobs.

By the way, they estimate that at least 20,000 jobs in the auto industry will come to the United States that would not have come otherwise. I come from Ohio, a big auto State. It is a State that cares a lot about manufacturing and, specifically, autos, and they are both going to be helped by this agreement.

Part of the way that it is going to create jobs here is by leveling the playing field on labor standards and enforcing those standards.

Also, it has higher content requirements for U.S.-made steel and intra-

auto parts that go into an automobile. As an example, USMCA requires that 70 percent of the steel going into cars come from North America. There is no provision like that in the status quo, in the NAFTA agreement. So this is a big improvement for us to drive more jobs here in America with regard to the steel production that goes into automobiles.

But, second, it says that 75 percent of the overall content in USMCA automobiles that are sold through this agreement have to be from North America. That is a big jump. In the current agreement, instead of 75 percent, NAFTA has 62.5 percent.

What does that mean? It means that if you make a car, say, in Mexico, and it has a bunch of parts in it that come from other countries, say, Japan or China or Germany, they can't take advantage of the USMCA's lower tariffs unless they have at least 75 percent North American content. So that is a big difference.

Now, there are some, including on my side of the aisle, that have criticized this provision and said that somehow this is a protectionist provision. Let me just make this point. We are agreeing with Canada and Mexico that we are going to have a new agreement with them that lowers barriers, tariffs, and non-tariff barriers on our borders with Canada and Mexico. We are taking advantage of that, with each other trading back and forth. That is why we will have more trade. That is why we will have more jobs.

If other countries want to take advantage of that by coming into Mexico or Canada and adding parts to the cars, they are free riders because they are not giving us the reciprocal access to their markets as Canada and Mexico are. That is why I think this agreement makes sense.

Now, I think it will incentivize two things. One, it will incentivize more jobs here—auto jobs, manufacturing jobs, steel jobs. But, second, it will incentivize those other countries to enter into a trade agreement with us.

We have talked about this with Japan. We have taken the first step in starting to put together what is considered a broader free trade agreement. I hope we get to one. It would be important.

But if they can simply free ride on existing agreements by having their stuff be transshipped from another country into the United States to take advantage of the lower tariffs that we are providing to Canada and Mexico, they wouldn't have that incentive to trade with us with their own agreement. So I think this is a good thing for encouraging more trade agreements and more trade openness.

The International Trade Commission also tells us that the USMCA is going to grow our economy. In fact, they say it is going to grow our economy by double the gross domestic product of that which was projected under the Trans-Pacific Partnership. Some may remember that agreement, the TPP.

Many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle, held that agreement up as one that would have been great for America and that we should be part of it. I think it is important that we trade with our neighbors in Latin America and in the Pacific Rim, but, frankly, that agreement that was touted as being so great had less than half of the economic growth that we are talking about here. So this has more than doubled the economic growth we saw in the TPP.

Second, the USMCA means new rules of the road for online sales. This is really important. So much of our economy today and our commerce takes place online, and yet there is nothing in NAFTA on it. If you think about it, 25 years ago there was no significant online commerce, and so there is nothing in the agreement. Whereas, in this agreement, there are a few things that are very important.

For my State of Ohio and, really, for our entire country, a lot of our commerce is done online now. We have a lot of small businesses engaged in it. They want to do business with Mexico and Canada, but they have no protections—no protections from tariffs. They can be assessed on that trade. This says no tariffs.

Also, data localization is something some countries are doing to American online companies. So if you are in online commerce in America, another country may say: Do you know what? You can do business in our country only if you localize your data, meaning the servers have to be in our country—in Mexico or in Canada, as an example.

This agreement says no. It prohibits that data localization requirement, which allows us to sell more to those countries without having to place our servers there.

It also says that the *de minimis* level on customs duties for sales online is increased. This saves money because people can now be involved in commerce with Canada and Mexico and not pay as much in terms of the customs duties and the tariffs, but there are also incredible administrative burdens being lifted by not having to worry about that. So this is good for us because we do a lot of online commerce here.

Third, I would say that American farmers are strongly behind this agreement for a good reason, which is that it opens up more markets for them and adds more certainty for them. Again, the NAFTA accord is 25 years old, and we had hoped during the last 25 years that we would get at some of the protectionist policies, particularly with regard to Canada and with regard to dairy and wheat and other issues, but we didn't have much success until now. Now, with the USMCA, we have the ability to send more of our stuff to these countries, and that is why the ag community is so excited about it. Between bad weather, low prices, and a shrinking China market, our farmers have been hit hard, and this is a light at the end of the tunnel. That is why,

by the way, over 1,000 farm groups have come out in support of USMCA.

There are a lot of folks I hear talking who say one side won or one side lost in the negotiations over USMCA. I don't think that is it. I think because of the hard work of U.S. Trade Representative Bob Lighthizer and the Trump administration and President Trump himself supporting this and pushing it, I think neither side won but the American people won. And isn't that nice to see? I think that is why you saw today on the floor of the House of Representatives a vote of 385 to 41.

I think now more people are going to be able to benefit from trade with these two countries. For Ohio, Canada is, by far, our largest trading partner. Mexico is No. 2. So this is a big deal. It is more modernized trade. We have replaced an agreement that has shown its age with unenforceable labor standards and environmental standards, non-existent digital economy provisions, and outdated rules-of-origin provisions. This changes all that.

We waited long enough. It is time, now that the House has voted—as I said, this evening, which was great news—to get that legislation over here to ensure that we do have great victory for American farmers, for small businesses, for our manufacturers, for our online businesses, and so many others.

I look forward to the opportunity to be able to vote for it over here.

COMBATING METH AND COCAINE ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I would also like to talk for a moment about the legislation we just passed on the appropriations side.

There were two bills. One focused more on the national security and defense side. There are a lot of good things in there for Ohio, including the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and also for the Lima Tank Plant. Also, much more importantly, it is good for our military—for our men and women in uniform, who are on the frontlines every day, sacrificing for us.

We have shown through this legislation we just passed that we appreciate them. There is not only a pay raise, but also we are providing them the equipment and the modern technology they need to be able to be successful.

But I also noticed in the agreement that just passed, the first appropriations bill, that there is really important language with regard to the drug crisis that we face in this country.

I see my colleague SHELTON WHITEHOUSE is on the floor. I have worked with him over the years on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. Now we have a CARA 2.0 bill that we would like to see passed.

But the bottom line is that this House and Senate and President Obama and now President Trump have begun to address this problem in different ways over the last 3 or 4 years, and it is beginning to work. We are finally beginning to see, with regard to the opioid crisis, some success.

Recall that the opioid crisis is the worst drug epidemic we have ever faced in this country. In 2017, 72,000 Americans lost their lives to overdoses. That is more than we lost in the entire Vietnam war. Last year, we had a little better number. After 12 years of increases every year in overdose deaths, finally, last year, we had a slight decrease, and I think it is because of a lot of good work that has been done here, particularly with regard to the opioid crisis.

In Ohio, unfortunately, we have been in the center of the storm. We have been one of the top two or three States in the country in terms of overdose deaths.

Last year, in 2018, because of all the hard work we have done here at the Federal level, at the State level, and at the local level, we actually saw a decrease. We led the country with a 22-percent decrease in overdose deaths. So that is the good news, and it is because of the Comprehensive Addiction Recovery Act, which is bipartisan and which is working to provide more treatment and recovery services, to provide better prevention, and to provide more Narcan to reverse the effects of overdoses. It is also because of the 21st Century Cures Act, which provides funding for evidence-based programs to the States and the States decide how it is spent.

I was back home just this past week meeting with people who are getting the benefit of those programs. On Monday, I was at a home in Dayton, OH, that provides residential treatment for women who are addicted and pregnant and helps their children to be able to overcome the neonatal abstinence syndrome when they are born to a mother who is using. It is beginning to work.

I met two mothers who have turned their lives around, and I saw a beautiful baby who, at 5 weeks old, is going into the world brighter, cheerier, and with more opportunity because of the work that we have done here to provide funding to help.

But I will say we have found, having made progress on opioids, that other drugs are starting to come into our communities. This is not just an opioid problem. This is an addiction problem, and addiction is a disease that must be treated like other diseases.

Although we have made progress, we can't rest on our laurels. When I talk to those on the frontlines, as I did on Monday in Dayton with law enforcement—the sheriff was there for Montgomery County—but also to treatment providers, to those who are in the trenches, and talking to those who are recovering addicts who were there, they tell me about what is happening, which is that, increasingly, other drugs, including psychostimulants like crystal meth and cocaine, are making a horrible comeback in those communities.

Crystal meth coming in from Mexico is more pure and less expensive than ever. In fact, law enforcement tells me

that on the streets of Columbus, Dayton, Cleveland, or Cincinnati, crystal meth is sometimes less expensive than marijuana and yet much more powerful and much more dangerous.

So it is important that here in Congress we focus on how to respond to that. Although we have some great legislation out there with regard to opioid addiction, treatment, recovery, and how to deal with this, we have not done as well with regard to these new drugs coming in.

Part of the solution, of course, is to build up our security at our southern border, where we have seen larger and larger quantities of crystal meth, manufactured in Mexico, being brought into our country by these cartels from super labs, as they call them, in Mexico.

By the way, there were crystal meth labs over the years, but the volume was not nearly as high, and the cost was much higher. Now that it is cheaper and there is higher volume, you see the meth labs in our communities closing down, but for the wrong reason. It is not being made here anymore because the stuff coming from Mexico is so much more pure, more powerful, more deadly, and less expensive.

So for the people already struggling with methamphetamine or cocaine addiction, it is important that they have access to treatment, too, so they can get help.

What I have heard at the local level is this: We appreciate the funding on opioids, but we want more flexibility now to be able to use this funding to combat what is, in many of our communities, in Ohio, even a bigger problem, which is crystal meth and sometimes cocaine.

So I am pleased to say that in the legislation that we just passed here this evening, legislation that provides appropriations to deal with this addiction issue, we have provided that flexibility. We have said: Yes, we are going to continue to provide grants to help with regard to prevention and treatment and recovery and help with regard to getting people back on their feet and helping law enforcement, but we are going to allow local communities to use this funding both for opioids and for crystal meth and other drugs.

So my hope is that what we will see is some of the same progress we have made in opioids now happen with regard to some of these other substances.

I have introduced a bill called the Combating Meth and Cocaine Act—I introduced it in June of this year—to allow this kind of flexibility. That is an authorization bill that has already been introduced, and we have good bipartisan support for that.

But we went ahead today in these appropriations bill and did it for this year. So for this fiscal year, essentially, that legislation will be in effect. So for 2020 we are going to provide that flexibility.

I applaud the Senate appropriators for doing that. Again, I am proud of

Congress showing that we can be flexible and continue to fight a many-front war on this issue. It is not just about opioids. It is about addiction.

We also need to pass the authorization bill, the Combating Meth and Cocaine Act, and I hope that we will be able to do that after the first of the year to ensure that we can continue to address these public health threats and we can continue to provide for those whose future is so dim because of the addiction, and instead they be able to achieve their God-given purpose in life.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions during today's session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Majority Leader.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all of our colleagues, earlier this afternoon, my friend the Democratic leader and I had a cordial conversation. We discussed a potential path forward following the House Democrats' precedent-breaking impeachment of President Trump. Our conversation was cordial, but my friend from New York continues to insist on departing from the unanimous bipartisan precedent that 100 Senators approved before the beginning of President Clinton's trial.

Back in 1999, Senators recognized that there might well be disagreements about questions that would arise at the middle and end of the trial, such as witnesses. Here is what happened: All 100 Senators endorsed a commonsense solution. We divided the process into two stages. The first resolution passed unanimously before the trial began. It laid the groundwork, such as scheduling and structured early steps like opening arguments. Mid-trial questions such as witnesses were left until the middle of the trial when Senators could make a more informed judgment about that more contentious issue. All 100 Senators, including me, including Mr. SCHUMER, and a number of our colleagues on both sides who were here in 1999 endorsed the first resolution as a bipartisan, minimalist first step.

As of today, however, we remain at an impasse because my friend the Democratic leader continues to demand a new and different set of rules for President Trump. He wants to break from that unanimous bipartisan precedent and force an all-or-nothing approach. My colleague wants a special pretrial guarantee of certain witnesses whom the House Democrats themselves

did not bother to pursue as they assembled their case, or he wants to proceed without giving any organizational resolution whatsoever. As I said, we remain at an impasse on these logistics.

For myself, I continue to believe that the unanimous bipartisan precedent that was good enough for President Clinton ought to be good enough for President Trump. Fair is fair.

Now, of course, there is the matter of the Articles of Impeachment themselves. It is a highly unusual step. The House continues to hem and haw about whether and when she intends to take the normal next step and transmit the House's accusations over here to the Senate. Some House Democrats imply they are withholding the articles for some kind of leverage so they can dictate the Senate process to Senators.

I admit, I am not sure what leverage there is in refraining from sending us something we do not want; but, alas, if they can figure that out, they can explain it. Meanwhile, other House Democrats seem to be suggesting they prefer never to transmit the articles. That is fine with me, and the Speaker of the House herself has been unclear on this. Her message has been somewhat muddled.

So here is where we are, Mr. President. We have a curious situation where, following House Democrats' rush to impeachment, following weeks of pronouncement about the urgency of the situation, the prosecutors appear to have developed cold feet. The House Democrat prosecution seems to have gotten cold feet and to be unsure of whether they even want to proceed to the trial.

As I said, a very unusual spectacle and, in my view, certainly not one that reflects well on the House. So we will see whether House Democrats ever want to work up the courage to actually take their accusations to trial.

Let me close with this: I am proud that the Senate came together today to confirm more well-qualified nominees and to pass major legislation for the American people.

I wish all of my colleagues a merry Christmas, happy holidays, and a joyous new year. I hope everyone enjoys this important time with their families and loved ones. We will see you in 2020.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, finally, for the information of all of our colleagues, the Senate will convene on Friday, January 3, to kick off the 2nd session of the 116th Congress. However, no rollcall votes are expected that day, and Members should be prepared to be back and voting on Monday, January 6.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SECURING AMERICAN NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS AGAINST TERRORISM ACT OF 2019

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, as we all know, there have been increased incidents of violence and threats against some of our faith-based institutions over the past decade. The FBI has been able to monitor this and unfortunately tells us that these attacks are likely to continue. We need to do a better job of figuring out how to disrupt these attacks but also to harden these facilities.

When the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh was attacked, it was the worst anti-Semitic violence in the history of our country. Shortly after that, I went to Youngstown, OH, which is very near the Pittsburgh synagogue that was attacked. It was within the next week or two afterwards, and there were very raw feelings, as you can imagine. We talked about what was needed to provide better protection for houses of worship—our synagogues, our churches, our mosques—and we came up with an idea to provide for a grant program from the expertise of the Department of Homeland Security where they could provide best practices, consulting, placement of cameras, you know, where it is necessary to harden facilities, where it is necessary to have a door with locks—simple things that can save lives.

That program has now been appropriated. In the legislation we just passed, there was a \$90 million appropriation for this program. The Jewish community, the Christian community, the Muslim community, the Sikh community, the Hindu community, and others are very supportive of this program.

H.R. 2476 is the legislation I am talking about this evening, called the Securing American Nonprofit Organizations Against Terrorism Act. Tonight, I am hopeful that we can pass, by unanimous consent, this legislation. In the appropriations bill, there is a \$90 million appropriation from Congress for the program for this fiscal year. Our authorization bill is at \$75 million. Again, it is a very important program.

I am pleased that the Department of Homeland Security has recently changed its rules to allow these institutions to use the funds not just for cameras, locks, and other hardening but also for armed guards where necessary. Sadly, it is necessary to disrupt and stop some of these hate crimes that are occurring.

Senator MIKE LEE had some concerns about the cost. I understand his concern. We are going to keep the cost in an efficient and effective manner—going to the organizations that really need it. I appreciate his talking to me about that tonight and his willingness to allow us to move forward on this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2476 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2476) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PORTMAN. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2476) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

FALLEN WARRIOR BATTLEFIELD CROSS MEMORIAL ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, another bill has been cleared tonight that I would like to ask the U.S. Senate to provide unanimous consent for. This is legislation called the Fallen Warrior Battlefield Cross Memorial Act. This comes out of a situation in Ohio where some of our veterans were not permitted to have a battlefield cross at their grave site.

Senator BROWN, myself, and other Members have been supportive of this legislation, and tonight I am pleased to say that we now have unanimous consent from the other side of the aisle to proceed with it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1424 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1424) to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Veterans Affairs permits the display of Fallen Soldier Displays in national cemeteries.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1424) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 497.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of LaJuana S. Wilcher, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wilcher nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from PN1228 and the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: PN1228, Executive Calendar Nos. 492 and 496.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Thomas B. Chapman, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2023; Michael Graham, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2020; Michael Graham, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2025. (Reappointment)

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions; that no further motions be in

order; and that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Chapman, Graham, and Graham (Reappointment) nominations, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 553.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Brett Blanton, of Virginia, to be Architect of the Capitol for the term of ten years.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Blanton nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged and the Senate proceed to the consideration of PN1318, 1319, and 1321; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements to the nominations be printed in the RECORD and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

The following-named Members of the Foreign Service of the Department of State to be a Foreign Service Officer, a Consular Officer, and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Shon Stephen Belcher, of the District of Columbia

Charles C. Blake III, of the District of Columbia

David L. Bruns, of Florida

Pedro G. Campo-Boue, of Florida

Hsiao-Ching Chang, of California

Jasmin S. Cho, of Washington

Nurit S. Einik, of Florida

Michael H. Elliott, of Wyoming

Lindsay C. Fair, of Texas

Leslie M. Fenton, of California

Owen P. Fletcher, of California

William West Follmer, of Maryland

Jean M. Foster, of Colorado

Nicholas J. Geboy, of the District of Columbia

Elizabeth A. Gee, of Florida

Juliana E. Hanson, of North Carolina

Richard E. Heater, of Texas

Dennie S. Hoopingarner, of Michigan

Jeffrey A. Jackson, of Connecticut

Joshua W. Kamp, of New York

Joseph J. Kim, of the District of Columbia

Olena A. Krawciw, of Virginia

Laura A. MacArthur, of California

Caroline J. Mann, of Florida

Brian C. McKean, of Florida

Keavy C. Nahan, of Texas

Paul A. Roelle, of Pennsylvania

Jennine R. Rudnitski, of Minnesota

Timothy C. Sarraile, of Virginia

Adam L. Schick, of Washington

Cigdem Zeynep Soyluglu-Hoyt, of California

Tyler J. Stoddard, of Idaho

Shravan Surendra, of Virginia

Brittany D. Thompson, of Virginia

Aaron D. Tiffany, of Washington

Dimitri Varmazis, of Massachusetts

Jonathan Blake Vaughan, of Tennessee

Tamara Lyn Picardo Rivera Wilson, of Virginia

Kathryn M. Wiseman, of Texas

The following-named Career Members of the Foreign Service for promotion into the Senior Foreign Service, as a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, and a Consular Officer and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Gharun S. Lacy, of Maryland

David Mango, of New York

The following-named Members of the Foreign Service of the Department of State to be a Consular Officer and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Kara Miriam Abramson, of the District of Columbia

Eunice O. Ajayi, of Maryland

Dane Dixon Allen-Bryant, of the District of Columbia

Robert Steven Baker, of Virginia

Daniel Dee Barelo, of Virginia

Kevin Silas Barlow, of Georgia

Nikki Barnes, of Maryland

Tyra Zuri Hayes Beam, of Virginia

Aaron Walter Becker, of Virginia

Rami Lowell Blair, of Rhode Island

Joseph Thorel Bodell, of Virginia

Miguel Alexander Boluda, of the District of Columbia

Samantha R. BonenClark, of Florida

Stefanie Michelle Braswell, of the District of Columbia

Daniel John Buchman, of New York

Thomas Adams Buckley, of Virginia

Robert Scott Bunch, of Virginia

Taryn E. Burton, of Virginia

Randall Eugene Bussman, of Virginia

Coleman David Butterworth, of Virginia

Corinne Denise Calabro, of Virginia

Nichelle I. Carter, of Maryland

Caitlin Marie Cassot, of Washington

Eduardo Castillo, Jr., of Texas

Min-Ling Chang, of Maryland

Lillian Katharine Chreky, of Virginia

Anthony Cyprian Christian, of Maryland

Matthew Franklin Clark, of Virginia

Kempton J. Cox, of Idaho

Cory David Curran, of Virginia

John R. Daniliuk, of the District of Columbia

Daniel Alan DeGroff, of Florida

Alexandra R. Del Solar, of the District of Columbia

Tariq Q. Desir, of Virginia
 Saumya V. Deva, of California
 Anika Marie DeVolder, of the District of Columbia
 Rurik H. Diehl, of Virginia
 Jacob E. Dietrich, of Kentucky
 Surayya Imani Diggs, of New York
 Christa L. Divis, of South Carolina
 Bennett K. Domingues, of Virginia
 Joyce E. Dudley, of Maryland
 Mark Philip Duggan, of Virginia
 Stephen Edinger, of Virginia
 Kelsey Brooke Egan, of Virginia
 Nurmukhamed A. Eldosov, of Ohio
 Gregory R. Elrod, of South Carolina
 Steven M. Elwood, of Virginia
 Maryan Adel Fouad Farag, of Virginia
 Christopher Franklin, of Maryland
 Sydney L. Freeman, of New Jersey
 Sayer French, of Virginia
 James Andrew Galindo, of Virginia
 Katie Vanessa Garay, of Virginia
 Beau Paul Garrett, of Washington
 Kuros Ghaffari, of the District of Columbia
 Emily Ruth Goodell, of Virginia
 Daniel Guindon, of Virginia
 Ameera Rumana Hamid, of the District of Columbia
 John Joseph Harrington III, of the District of Columbia
 Allison Kelly Haugen, of Washington
 Corey A. Henton, of Virginia
 Sarah Melissa Hernandez, of Texas
 Matthew H. Hinson, of New Jersey
 Dylan R. Hoey, of Wisconsin
 Alexander Joseph Holmes, of Virginia
 Lauren E. Holt, of the District of Columbia
 Jesse J. Hong, of the District of Columbia
 Lauren Kimberly Hovis, of Virginia
 Tony Hudson, Jr., of Georgia
 Christine Rene Huff, of Virginia
 Terrell Dwayne Hunt, of Indiana
 Andrew William Hutto, of Virginia
 Betty Ngoc Huynh, of the District of Columbia
 Ty Anthony Isom, of Virginia
 Nathan R. Johnson, of Minnesota
 Gregory K. Joy, of New York
 Waqqas Khalid, of the District of Columbia
 Andrew J. King, of Virginia
 Johanna L. Knoch, of Colorado
 Keshia Mae Kuhn, of Tennessee
 Freddy Ouandja Lakoundzi, of Virginia
 Sean M. Lawlor, of Virginia
 Hilary B. Lepuil, of Virginia
 Brian Geoffrey Lipski, of Virginia
 Ingrid Jenai Lomax, of Virginia
 Patrick Joseph Lukanich, of Virginia
 Michael Patrick Lynch, of the District of Columbia
 Brendan Elias Magnuson, of Virginia
 Henry Patrick Mahoney, of Virginia
 Michael P. Marette, of Virginia
 James M. Marino, of Virginia
 Lynn Edmonds McCredy, Jr., of Virginia
 Heather Ailene McInnis, of Virginia
 Alexander Paul McKenney, of Virginia
 Andreo Micic, of Virginia
 Larissa M. Mihalisko, of Virginia
 Brandon Milford, of Virginia
 Vanessa Jane Moglin, of Virginia
 Marc Andrew Monroig, of New York
 William Robert Montgomery, of Virginia
 Sanjay Y. Murty, of Virginia
 Aseebulla A. Niazi, of New Hampshire
 Steven Paul Nicholson, of Florida
 Ashley Jo Niedermayer, of Virginia
 Kimberly G. Ofobike, of Virginia
 Christel Oomen, of Oregon
 Kelsey Ann Orr, of North Carolina
 Mary E. Overbeck, of Virginia
 Noor Badreldin Oweis, of the District of Columbia
 Laura J. Park, of the District of Columbia
 Catherine Nicole Plant, of Virginia
 Benjamin Michael Quinn, of Virginia
 Grayson Edward Ramsey, of Virginia
 Gregory J. Redmann, of Virginia

Tyler Jay Reis, of the District of Columbia
 Clark E. Robertson, of Virginia
 Lori A. Roberts, of Virginia
 Nicole R. Roberts, of Massachusetts
 Kalif R. Robinson, of Georgia
 Natalie R. Rooks, of Colorado
 Nicholas L. Roscoe, of Virginia
 William H. Z. Schlossberg, of Virginia
 Patrick Shilladay Scott, of Virginia
 Mehek Sethi, of Georgia
 Patrick M. Sheehan, of the District of Columbia
 Kristina Sherman, of Virginia
 Madelyn D. Smith, of Washington
 Axel Spaeh, of Virginia
 Michael A. Stock, of Kansas
 Camille Z. Swinson, of Massachusetts
 Melinda Leanne Thompson, of Virginia
 Hawi T. Tilahune, of Minnesota
 Sulaiman H. Toghral, of West Virginia
 Minh H. Tokuyama, of the District of Columbia
 Jesus Amador Torres, of Virginia
 Ryan L. Trunk, of the District of Columbia
 Valerie N. Tucker, of Florida
 Kaitlyn R. Turner, of Virginia
 Pablo Jairo Tutillo Maldonado, of Connecticut
 Jessica Erin Tylecki, of Virginia
 Juan-Paulo Varela, of California
 Gilberto Manuel Velazquez-Aponte, of Virginia
 Cale F. Wagner, of North Dakota
 Jeffrey Lee Watts, of Texas
 Michael J. Weber, of Minnesota
 Steven Duane Weber, of Virginia
 Kelsey L. Williams, of Florida
 Chelsea A. Wilson, of Maryland
 Henry B. Wilson, of Virginia
 Jordan L. Wilson, of the District of Columbia
 Alexandra Marie Zolnowski, of the District of Columbia
 Derek Jason Zoretic, of Virginia
 Megan Elizabeth Zurowski, of Virginia
 The following-named Members of the Foreign Service of the Department of State to be a Consular Officer and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:
 Jenny U. Abamu, of Texas
 Sean Gregory Allan, of Virginia
 Maximilian E. Aviles, of California
 Martha Jeannette Berry, of Texas
 Rohini Bhaumik, of Virginia
 Donald Judson Blakeslee, of Virginia
 Rausan Borujerdi, of New York
 Timothy A. Bowman, of Virginia
 Logan Victor Brog, of the District of Columbia
 Cameron C. Brown, of Virginia
 Jeffrey S. Bunting, of Virginia
 Thomas Clifford Burgess, of Virginia
 Diane Elizabeth Carroll, of Illinois
 Patrick B. Cheetham, of Virginia
 Joanna D. Chen, of New York
 Lacy Hebert Cheung, of Virginia
 Veronica P. Chiu, of Connecticut
 Jennifer Elizabeth Cole, of the District of Columbia
 Amy E. Conroy, of Connecticut
 Kaitlin Ann Crile, of Virginia
 Corey James Crowley, of the District of Columbia
 Andrew K. Danto, of Pennsylvania
 Tanya N. Donangmaye, of New York
 Kelly E. DuBois, of Alaska
 Alyssa Hope Feldstein, of the District of Columbia
 Faith E. Fugar, of Maryland
 Adam John Gallagher, of California
 Usra Ghazi, of the District of Columbia
 Marichuy Gomez, of California
 Alan Huston Gordon, of the District of Columbia
 Joy P. Grainger, of South Carolina
 Oleksandra V. Gubina, of the District of Columbia

Abdulrahman Mohammed Habeeb, of the District of Columbia
 Frank Forester Leslie Harrington IV, of West Virginia
 Jerry Wayne Haynes II, of Virginia
 Meredith Noelle Healy, of Colorado
 Jeffrey N. Henry, of Virginia
 Manuela Hernandez, of Florida
 Simon Andrew Hessler, of Virginia
 Sven Bertil Hestrand, of Virginia
 Lisa B. Hoeksema, of the District of Columbia
 Richard S. Holliday, of the District of Columbia
 Anket Holmes, of California
 Wayne William Hosek, of Virginia
 Kelly Elizabeth Johnson, of Virginia
 Rachel E. King, of Ohio
 Ethan N. Kinney, of Alabama
 James Allen Koehler, of Virginia
 Sarah Michelle Koelbl, of Virginia
 Sierra N. Lekie, of Virginia
 James Allan Lobb II, of Virginia
 Lukas Loncko, of Virginia
 Kevin Lynch, of Virginia
 Kamila P. Manzueta, of Florida
 Gregory James Marchwinski, of Virginia
 Christopher Alan Marsh, of California
 Joseph R. Martello, of Virginia
 Donna Catherine Marzo, of Virginia
 Patrick T. Maxwell, of Pennsylvania
 Benjamin R. McIntosh, of California
 Katharine Armstrong Jensen McIntosh, of Virginia
 Austin Blaine McKinney, of Michigan
 Ryan James McNamara, of Virginia
 Lauren A. Meinhart, of Virginia
 Manuel Jose Menocal, of Virginia
 Elizabeth M. Meravi, of Massachusetts
 Caryl Anna Merten, of the District of Columbia
 Brittanie Anne Morrison, of Virginia
 Fatima T. Morrisroe, of Virginia
 Stephanie L. Muller, of Virginia
 Radha Neelakantan, of the District of Columbia
 Christina E. Paul, of Florida
 James Campbell Pershing, of Massachusetts
 Amanda Peskin, of Colorado
 Lance Erich Peterson, of Virginia
 Siobhan J. Pollock, of Virginia
 Jamaica Afiya Pouncy, of Texas
 David Allen Rackovan, Jr., of the District of Columbia
 Kathryn L. Rasmussen, of Wisconsin
 Liliac Acacia Reeder, of the District of Columbia
 Elisabeth Jane Reigel, of Virginia
 Natalie Ruth Reynolds, of Virginia
 Kelly James Rice, of South Carolina
 Christopher Blake Rollins, of the District of Columbia
 Kevin James Rosati, of Virginia
 Joseph C. Russell, of Virginia
 Johanna P. Sanchez, of New York
 Tawni L. Sasaki, of California
 Yevgen Sautin, of Florida
 Jennifer M. Schmidt, of Oregon
 Brian E. Selman, of Texas
 Zinna Senbetta, of Illinois
 Claire Victoria Shelden, of Colorado
 Jennifer J. Shin, of New York
 Jennifer Lynn Shingler, of Virginia
 Harold Frank Joseph Shirley, of Virginia
 DeAndre D. Smith, of Maryland
 Trevor J. Smith, of Florida
 Caitlin A. Strawder, of Florida
 Dominick E. Tao, of Florida
 Mark S. Thompson, of Virginia
 Claire Elizabeth Vallin, of Michigan
 Sean David Varner, of Virginia
 Lauren J. Vine, of California
 Crystal N. Waitekus, of Virginia
 Grayson M. Walker, of Virginia
 Alexander F. Watson, of Florida
 Kristin Weber, of Virginia
 Sean Michael Weidner, of Maryland
 Elissa Marie Weingart, of Virginia

Terry-Ann T. Wellington, of Texas
 Uri Whang, of Virginia
 Julie L. Wilkins, of Virginia
 Leslie Elisabeth Wilson, of the District of
 Columbia
 Juwan A. Woods, of Louisiana
 Andrew Henry Wright, of Virginia
 Tiffany Jiun-Tyan Wu, of Virginia
 Sarahann Y. Yeh, of Virginia
 Hamda A. Yusuf, of Washington

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONSTRUCTION CONSENSUS PROCUREMENT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 203, S. 1434.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1434) to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Portman amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1269) was considered and agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the definition of reverse auction to cover the awarding of contracts and orders that are based solely on the price obtained through the auction process)

On page 3, line 12, strike “, in whole or in part, based” and insert “is solely based”.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1434

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON USE OF A REVERSE AUCTION FOR THE AWARD OF A CONTRACT FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION SERVICES.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that, in contrast to a traditional auction in which the buyers bid up the price, sellers bid down the price in a reverse auction.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation shall be amended to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for awarding contracts for design and construction services.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “design and construction services” means—

(A) site planning and landscape design;
 (B) architectural and engineering services (as defined in section 1102 of title 40, United States Code);

(C) interior design;

(D) performance of substantial construction work for facility, infrastructure, and environmental restoration projects;

(E) delivery and supply of construction materials to construction sites; or

(F) construction or substantial alteration of public buildings or public works.

(2) The term “reverse auction” means, with respect to any procurement by an executive agency—

(A) a real-time auction conducted through an electronic medium among 2 or more offerors who compete by submitting bids for a supply or service contract, or a delivery order, task order, or purchase order under the contract, with the ability to submit revised lower bids at any time before the closing of the auction; and

(B) the award of the contract, delivery order, task order, or purchase order to the offeror is solely based on the price obtained through the auction process.

END PLUSH RETIREMENTS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 274, S. 439.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 439) to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Government Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Cardin amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1270) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 2, strike lines 1 through 3 and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Members of Congress Pension Opt Out Clarification Act”.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Members of Congress Pension Opt Out Clarification Act”.

SEC. 2. MAKING FERS OPTIONAL FOR MEMBERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 8401(20) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “, and who (in the case)” and all that follows through “2004”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to an individual who first serves as a Member of the House of Representatives, including a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN TSP.—

(1) AMENDMENT.—Section 8401(20) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended—

(A) by striking “term ‘Member’ has” and inserting the following: “term ‘Member’—“(A) has”;

(B) by inserting “, subject to subparagraph (B),” after “except that”;

(C) by adding “and” after the semicolon at the end; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) for purposes of subchapter III, has the same meaning as provided in section 2106, without regard to whether the individual elects not to participate in the Federal Employees’ Retirement System.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO TSP.—Section 8431(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting “except as provided in section 8401(20)(B),” after “subchapter.”.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to an individual who makes an election described in section 8401(20) of title 5, United States Code, not to participate in the Federal Employees’ Retirement System before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS PROVIDER ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 221 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 221) to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Gardner substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1271), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Department of Veterans Affairs Provider Accountability Act”.

SEC. 2. ACCOUNTABILITY WITHIN VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) REPORTING MAJOR ADVERSE ACTIONS TO NATIONAL PRACTITIONER DATA BANK AND STATE LICENSING BOARDS.—Section 7461 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f)(1) Whenever the Under Secretary for Health (or an official designated by the Under Secretary) brings charges based on conduct or performance against a section 7401(1) employee and as a result of those charges a covered major adverse action is taken against the employee, the Under Secretary shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which such covered major adverse action is carried out—

“(A) transmit to the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services and the applicable State licensing board the name of the employee, a description of the covered major adverse action, and a description of the reason for the covered major adverse action; and

“(B) update the VetPro System, or successor system, with a record of the covered major adverse action taken and an indication that information was transmitted under subparagraph (A).

“(2) The Under Secretary for Health—

“(A) shall enroll all 7401(1) employees in a continuous query of their record within the National Practitioner Data Bank; and

“(B) shall develop and implement a mechanism for maintaining and updating the information collected through such continuous query within the VetPro System, or successor system, to facilitate the sharing of such information between Veterans Integrated Service Networks.

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘covered major adverse action’ means a major adverse action with respect to a section 7401(1) employee that originated from circumstances in which the behavior of the employee so substantially failed to meet generally-accepted standards of clinical practice as to raise reasonable concern for safety of patients.”.

(b) PROHIBITION ON SIGNING SETTLEMENTS WITH CERTAIN CLAUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not enter into a settlement agreement relating to an adverse action against a section 7401(1) employee under which the Department of Veterans Affairs would be required to conceal a serious medical error or a lapse in generally-accepted standards of clinical practice.

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a negative record if the head of the Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection of the Department and the Special Counsel (established by section 1211 of title 5, United States Code) jointly certify that the negative record is not legitimate.

(c) TRAINING ON CREDENTIALING AND PRIVILEGING.—The Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall provide to all staff of the Veterans Health Administration who handle hiring, privileging, and credentialing mandatory training on—

(1) all policies of the Veterans Health Administration for credentialing and privileging; and

(2) when and how to report adverse actions to the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services, State licensing boards, and other relevant entities.

(d) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON UPDATES TO THE VHA HANDBOOK.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress recognizes that the confusion regarding practices in the Veterans Health Administration for reporting to State licensing boards stems from a lack of guidance in the Veterans Health Administration handbook 1100.18;

(2) Congress strongly recommends that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs update such handbook to ensure that employees of the Veterans Health Administration, officials of the Veterans Integrated Services Networks, and officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs understand and are able to utilize the role of State licensing boards to effectively prevent instances of failed reporting and future patient safety concerns;

(3) Congress recognizes the broad authority of the Veterans Health Administration to report to State licensing boards those employed or separated health care professionals whose behavior and clinical practice so substantially failed to meet generally-accepted standards of clinical practice as to raise reasonable concern for safety of patients and requests that such handbook is updated to reflect appropriate reporting channels to ensure employee understanding of those procedures and authorities; and

(4) in developing the new handbook, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs should consult with—

(A) State licensing boards;

(B) the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services;

(C) the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services; and

(D) the exclusive representative of section 7401(1) employees.

(e) SECTION 7401(1) EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—In this section, the term “section 7401(1) employee” has the meaning given that term in section 7461(c)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

The bill (S. 221), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

IMPROVING SAFETY AND SECURITY FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3147, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3147) to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress reports on patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3147) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Improving Safety and Security for Veterans Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS REPORTS ON PATIENT SAFETY AND QUALITY OF CARE.

(a) REPORT ON PATIENT SAFETY AND QUALITY OF CARE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report regarding the policies and procedures of the Department relating to patient safety and quality of care and the steps that the Department has taken to make improvements in patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the policies and procedures of the Department and improvements made by the Department with respect to the following:

(i) How often the Department reviews or inspects patient safety at medical centers of the Department.

(ii) What triggers the aggregated review process at medical centers of the Department.

(iii) What controls the Department has in place for controlled and other high-risk substances, including the following:

(I) Access to such substances by staff.

(II) What medications are dispensed via automation.

(III) What systems are in place to ensure proper matching of the correct medication to the correct patient.

(IV) Controls of items such as medication carts and pill bottles and vials.

(V) Monitoring of the dispensing of medication within medical centers of the Department, including monitoring of unauthorized dispensing.

(iv) How the Department monitors contact between patients and employees of the Department, including how employees are monitored and tracked at medical centers of the Department when entering and exiting the room of a patient.

(v) How comprehensively the Department uses video monitoring systems in medical centers of the Department to enhance patient safety, security, and quality of care.

(vi) How the Department tracks and reports deaths at medical centers of the Department at the local level, Veterans Integrated Service Network level, and national level.

(vii) The procedures of the Department to alert local, regional, and Department-wide leadership when there is a statistically abnormal number of deaths at a medical center of the Department, including—

(I) the manner and frequency in which such alerts are made; and

(II) what is included in such an alert, such as the nature of death and where within the medical center the death occurred.

(viii) The use of root cause analyses with respect to patient deaths in medical centers of the Department, including—

(I) what threshold triggers a root cause analysis for a patient death;

(II) who conducts the root cause analysis; and

(III) how root cause analyses determine whether a patient death is suspicious or not.

(ix) What triggers a patient safety alert, including how many suspicious deaths cause a patient safety alert to be triggered.

(x) The situations in which an autopsy report is ordered for deaths at hospitals of the Department, including an identification of—

(I) when the medical examiner is called to review a patient death; and

(II) the official or officials that decide such a review is necessary.

(xi) The method for family members of a patient who died at a medical center of the Department to request an investigation into that death.

(xii) The opportunities that exist for family members of a patient who died at a medical center of the Department to request an autopsy for that death.

(xiii) The methods in place for employees of the Department to report suspicious deaths at medical centers of the Department.

(xiv) The steps taken by the Department if an employee of the Department is suspected to be implicated in a suspicious death at a medical center of the Department, including—

(I) actions to remove or suspend that individual from patient care or temporarily reassign that individual and the speed at which that action occurs; and

(II) steps taken to ensure that other medical centers of the Department and other non-Department medical centers are aware of the suspected role of the individual in a suspicious death.

(xv) In the case of the suspicious death of an individual while under care at a medical center of the Department, the methods used by the Department to inform the family members of that individual.

(xvi) The policy of the Department for communicating to the public when a suspicious death occurs at a medical center of the Department.

(B) A description of any additional authorities or resources needed from Congress to implement any of the actions, changes to policy, or other matters included in the report required under paragraph (1)

(b) REPORT ON DEATHS AT LOUIS A. JOHNSON MEDICAL CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Attorney General indicates that any investigation or trial related to the suspicious deaths of veterans at the Louis A. Johnson VA Medical Center in Clarksburg, West Virginia, (in this subsection referred to as the “Facility”) that occurred during 2017 and 2018 has sufficiently concluded, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the House of Representatives a report describing—

(A) the events that occurred during that period related to those suspicious deaths; and

(B) actions taken at the Facility and throughout the Department of Veterans Affairs to prevent any similar reoccurrence of the issues that contributed to those suspicious deaths.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A timeline of events that occurred at the Facility relating to the suspicious deaths described in paragraph (1) beginning the moment those deaths were first determined to be suspicious, including any notifications to—

(i) leadership of the Facility;

(ii) leadership of the Veterans Integrated Service Network in which the Facility is located;

(iii) leadership at the central office of the Department; and

(iv) the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(B) A description of the actions taken by leadership of the Facility, the Veterans Integrated Service Network in which the Facility is located, and the central office of the Department in response to the suspicious deaths, including responses to notifications under subparagraph (A).

(C) A description of the actions, including root cause analyses, autopsies, or other activities that were conducted after each of the suspicious deaths.

(D) A description of the changes made by the Department since the suspicious deaths to procedures to control access within medical centers of the Department to controlled and non-controlled substances to prevent harm to patients.

(E) A description of the changes made by the Department to its nationwide controlled substance and non-controlled substance policies as a result of the suspicious deaths.

(F) A description of the changes planned or made by the Department to its video surveillance at medical centers of the Department to improve patient safety and quality of care in response to the suspicious deaths.

(G) An analysis of the review of sentinel events conducted at the Facility in response to the suspicious deaths and whether that review was conducted consistent with policies and procedures of the Department.

(H) A description of the steps the Department has taken or will take to improve the monitoring of the credentials of employees of the Department to ensure the validity of those credentials, including all employees that interact with patients in the provision of medical care.

(I) A description of the steps the Department has taken or will take to monitor and mitigate the behavior of employee bad actors, including those who attempt to conceal their mistreatment of veteran patients.

(J) A description of the steps the Department has taken or will take to enhance or create new monitoring systems that—

(i) automatically collect and analyze data from medical centers of the Department and monitor for warnings signs or unusual health patterns that may indicate a health safety or quality problem at a particular medical center; and

(ii) automatically share those warnings with other medical centers of the Department, relevant Veterans Integrated Service Networks, and officials of the central office of the Department.

(K) A description of the accountability actions that have been taken at the Facility to remove or discipline employees who significantly participated in the actions that contributed to the suspicious deaths.

(L) A description of the system-wide reporting process that the Department will or has implemented to ensure that relevant employees are properly reported, when applicable, to the National Practitioner Data Bank of the Department of Health and Human Services, the applicable State licensing boards, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and other relevant entities.

(M) A description of any additional authorities or resources needed from Congress to implement any of the recommendations or findings included in the report required under paragraph (1).

(N) Such other matters as the Secretary considers necessary.

PERMITTING THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO ESTABLISH A GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2385 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2385) to permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2385) was passed.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZING STATES AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT RECEIVE GRANTS FROM THE NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT, EXPANSION, OR IMPROVEMENT OF A VETERANS’ CEMETERIES TO USE AMOUNTS OF SUCH GRANTS FOR STATE AND TRIBAL ORGANIZATION CEMETERY PERSONNEL TO TRAIN AT THE TRAINING CENTER OF THE NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 2096 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2096) to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize States and tribal organizations that receive grants from the National Cemetery Administration for establishment, expansion, or improvement of a veterans’ cemeteries to use amounts of such grants for State and tribal organization cemetery personnel to train at the training center of the National Cemetery Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Boozman substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1272), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. TRAINING OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERY PERSONNEL BY NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION.

Section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—
(A) in subparagraph (A)—
(i) by striking “and (ii) the cost” and inserting “(ii) the cost”; and

(ii) by inserting “; and (iii) training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration” before the semicolon; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—
(i) by striking “and (ii) the cost” and inserting “(ii) the cost”; and

(ii) by inserting “; and (iii) training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration” before the period;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) A grant under this section for a purpose described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) may be used, solely or in part, for training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration.”.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2096), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TRAINING OF STATE VETERANS CEMETERY PERSONNEL BY NATIONAL CEMETERY ADMINISTRATION.

Section 2408 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—
(A) in subparagraph (A)—
(i) by striking “and (ii) the cost” and inserting “(ii) the cost”; and

(ii) by inserting “; and (iii) training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration” before the semicolon; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—
(i) by striking “and (ii) the cost” and inserting “(ii) the cost”; and

(ii) by inserting “; and (iii) training costs, including travel expenses, associated with

attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration” before the period;

(2) by redesignating subsections (c) through (f) as subsections (d) through (g), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) A grant under this section for a purpose described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (a)(1) may be used, solely or in part, for training costs, including travel expenses, associated with attendance at training provided by the National Cemetery Administration.”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MERCHANT MARINERS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 550 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 550) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Murkowski substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1273), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) 2019 marked the 74th anniversary of Allied victory in World War II.

(2) The United States Merchant Marine (in this section referred to as the “Merchant Marine”) was integral in providing the link between domestic production and the fighting forces overseas, providing combat equipment, fuel, food, commodities, and raw materials to troops stationed abroad.

(3) Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King acknowledged the indispensability of the Merchant Marine to the victory in a 1945 letter stating that, without the support of the Merchant Marine, “the Navy could not have accomplished its mission”.

(4) President, and former Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces, Dwight D. Eisenhower acknowledged that “through the prompt delivery of supplies and equipment to our armed forces overseas, and of cargoes representing economic and military aid to friendly nations, the American Merchant Marine has effectively helped to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world”.

(5) Military missions and war planning were contingent upon the availability of resources and the Merchant Marine played a vital role in this regard, ensuring the efficient and reliable transoceanic transport of military equipment and both military and civilian personnel.

(6) The Merchant Marine provided for the successful transport of resources and personnel despite consistent and ongoing exposure to enemy combatants from both the air and the sea, including from enemy bomber squadrons, submarines, and naval mines.

(7) The efforts of the Merchant Marine were not without sacrifices as the Merchant Marine likely bore a higher per-capita casualty rate than any of the military branches during the war.

(8) The Merchant Marine proved to be an instrumental asset on an untold number of occasions, participating in every landing operation by the United States Marine Corps, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa.

(9) The Merchant Marine provided the bulk tonnage of material necessary for the invasion of Normandy, an invasion which, according to a 1944 New York Times article, “would not have been possible without the Merchant Marine”.

(10) In assessing the performance of the Merchant Marine, General Eisenhower stated, “every man in this Allied command is quick to express his admiration for the loyalty, courage, and fortitude of the officers and men of the Merchant Marine. We count upon their efficiency and their utter devotion to duty as we do our own; they have never failed us”.

(11) During a September 1944 speech, President Franklin D. Roosevelt stated that the Merchant Marine had “delivered the goods when and where needed in every theater of operations and across every ocean in the biggest, the most difficult, and dangerous transportation job ever undertaken. As time goes on, there will be greater public understanding of our merchant fleet’s record during this war”.

(12) The feats and accomplishments of the Merchant Marine are deserving of broader public recognition.

(13) The United States will be forever grateful and indebted to these merchant mariners for their effective, reliable, and courageous transport of goods and resources in enemy territory throughout theaters of every variety in World War II.

(14) The goods and resources transported by the Merchant Marine saved thousands of lives and enabled the Allied Powers to claim victory in World War II.

(15) The Congressional Gold Medal would be an appropriate way to shed further light on the service of the merchant mariners in World War II and the instrumental role they played in winning that war.

(16) Many students of the Merchant Marine Academy lost their lives as they sailed through enemy-controlled waters or unloaded cargo in overseas combat areas, and, as a result, the United States Merchant Marine Academy is the only institution among the 5 Federal academies to be authorized to carry a battle standard as part of its color guard.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) **AWARD AUTHORIZED.**—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

(b) **DESIGN AND STRIKING.**—For the purposes of the award described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall strike the gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) **AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE MUSEUM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Following the award of the gold medal under subsection (a), the gold medal shall be given to the American Merchant Marine Museum, where it will be available for display as appropriate and available for research.

(2) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that the American Merchant Marine Museum should make the gold medal given to the Museum under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at appropriate locations associated with the United States Merchant Marine and that preference should be given to locations affiliated with the United States Merchant Marine.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 3, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) **NATIONAL MEDALS.**—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 550), as amended, was passed.

DOGS AS WITNESS GUARDIANS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1029 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1029) to allow the use of certified facility dogs in criminal proceedings in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Cornyn amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1274), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Courthouse Dogs Act”.

SEC. 2. USE OF CERTIFIED FACILITY DOG FOR TESTIMONY IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3502 the following:

“§ 3503. Use of certified facility dog for testimony in criminal proceedings

“(a) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term ‘certified facility dog’ means a dog that has graduated from an assistance dog organization that is a member of an internationally recognized assistance dog association that has a primary purpose of granting accreditation based on standards of excellence in areas of—

- “(1) assistance dog acquisition;
- “(2) dog training;
- “(3) dog handler training; and
- “(4) dog placement.

“(b) **REQUESTS FOR USE OF CERTIFIED FACILITY DOGS.**—Either party in a criminal proceeding in a Federal court may apply for an order from the court to allow a certified facility dog, if available, to be present with a witness testifying before the court through—

- “(1) in-person testimony; or
- “(2) testimony televised by 2-way, closed-circuit television.

“(c) **CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL.**—A Federal court may enter an order authorizing an available certified facility dog to accompany a witness while testifying at a hearing in accordance with subsection (b) if the court finds that—

- “(1) the dog to be used qualifies as a certified facility dog;
- “(2) the use of a certified facility dog will aid the witness in providing testimony; and
- “(3) upon a showing by the party seeking an order under subsection (b), the certified facility dog is insured for liability protection.

“(d) **HANDLERS.**—Each certified facility dog authorized to accompany a witness under subsection (c) shall be accompanied by a handler who is—

- “(1) trained to manage the certified facility dog by an assistance dog organization described in subsection (a); and
- “(2) a professional working in the legal system with knowledge about the legal and criminal justice processes.

“(e) **DEADLINE.**—The party seeking an order under subsection (b) shall apply for such order not later than 14 days before the preliminary hearing, trial date, or other hearing to which the order is to apply.

“(f) **OTHER ORDERS.**—A Federal court may make such orders as may be necessary to preserve the fairness of the proceeding, including imposing restrictions on, and instructing the jury regarding, the presence of the certified facility dog during the proceedings.

“(g) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent a Federal court from providing any other accommodations to a witness in accordance with applicable law.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The chapter analysis for chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3502 the following:

“3503. Use of certified facility dog for testimony in criminal proceedings.”.

The bill (S. 1029), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1029

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Courthouse Dogs Act”.

SEC. 2. USE OF CERTIFIED FACILITY DOG FOR TESTIMONY IN CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 223 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3502 the following:

“§ 3503. Use of certified facility dog for testimony in criminal proceedings

“(a) **DEFINED TERM.**—In this section, the term ‘certified facility dog’ means a dog that has graduated from an assistance dog organization that is a member of an internationally recognized assistance dog association that has a primary purpose of granting accreditation based on standards of excellence in areas of—

- “(1) assistance dog acquisition;
- “(2) dog training;
- “(3) dog handler training; and
- “(4) dog placement.

“(b) **REQUESTS FOR USE OF CERTIFIED FACILITY DOGS.**—Either party in a criminal proceeding in a Federal court may apply for an order from the court to allow a certified facility dog, if available, to be present with a witness testifying before the court through—

- “(1) in-person testimony; or
- “(2) testimony televised by 2-way, closed-circuit television.

“(c) **CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL.**—A Federal court may enter an order authorizing an available certified facility dog to accompany a witness while testifying at a hearing in accordance with subsection (b) if the court finds that—

- “(1) the dog to be used qualifies as a certified facility dog;
- “(2) the use of a certified facility dog will aid the witness in providing testimony; and
- “(3) upon a showing by the party seeking an order under subsection (b), the certified facility dog is insured for liability protection.

“(d) **HANDLERS.**—Each certified facility dog authorized to accompany a witness under subsection (c) shall be accompanied by a handler who is—

- “(1) trained to manage the certified facility dog by an assistance dog organization described in subsection (a); and
- “(2) a professional working in the legal system with knowledge about the legal and criminal justice processes.

“(e) **DEADLINE.**—The party seeking an order under subsection (b) shall apply for such order not later than 14 days before the preliminary hearing, trial date, or other hearing to which the order is to apply.

“(f) **OTHER ORDERS.**—A Federal court may make such orders as may be necessary to preserve the fairness of the proceeding, including imposing restrictions on, and instructing the jury regarding, the presence of the certified facility dog during the proceedings.

“(g) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent a Federal court from providing any other accommodations to a witness in accordance with applicable law.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The chapter analysis for chapter 223 of title 18, United

States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3502 the following:

“3503. Use of certified facility dog for testimony in criminal proceedings.”.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following resolutions introduced earlier today en bloc: S. Res. 459, S. Res. 460, and S. Res. 461.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

AMERICAN GEOPHYSICAL UNION CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in recognition of its centennial anniversary, I rise to offer my congratulations and appreciation to the American Geophysical Union, also known as the AGU. Since December 1919, the AGU has played an instrumental role in supporting international cooperation while also fostering American leadership in the fields of Earth and space science. Senator MURKOWSKI and I introduced a resolution in honor of this critical milestone, and I am pleased to see the Senate pass it today.

The National Research Council created the AGU as the representative for the United States of America in the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics in 1919. Only 1 year after the end of World War I, this was an occasion for international cooperation that illustrated the importance of bridging divides in the name of science. The AGU is a prime example of our Nation's commitment to a vision of shared peace and prosperity, and by serving as a key forum for gifted geophysicists from across the world, it is an example of our positive role in the international community for advancing knowledge.

In the century since its founding, the AGU has connected countless geophysicists to facilitate information-sharing, peer review, and innovation. The AGU today counts more than 60,000 scientists and students among its membership, across 137 countries. Their work has not only expanded our understanding of our home planet and the celestial bodies beyond, but it has also led to critical health, environmental, commercial, and technological breakthroughs. If we are to confront climate change and other systemic challenges and, indeed, if we are truly to live as stewards in harmony with our surroundings, humanity needs the international cooperation and scientific integrity the AGU demonstrates so aptly.

It is my hope that this resolution and the occasion of the AGU's centennial anniversary can inspire us all to appreciate the significance of scientific integrity and independence. Research from the geophysical community has deeply informed our society on the

need for responding to pressing challenges, chief among them climate change. But unfortunately, it is not always so easy. Under President Trump, scientists have had to censor their work, voluntarily or involuntarily, due to political interference.

Under the Trump administration, for instance, the United States Geological Survey has opted to limit the scope of the projected consequences of climate change through 2040, despite the agency's historic use of models stretching through 2100. Perhaps more worrisome, the White House released an Executive Order on June 14, 2019, that instructs each agency to slash at least one-third of its advisory committees, which consist of experts and scientists ready to advise on a wide range of issues, especially for the Environmental Protection Agency.

Through reason and empiricism, science brings us closer to the truth. When administration officials or other individuals purposefully interfere with science to paint an incomplete, inaccurate, or misleading image, science ceases to be science and becomes just another battleground for politics. Policymakers should not be in the business of manipulating or silencing the work of the men and women who make up the scientific community. We should let scientists do their jobs. The AGU has done an excellent job representing many of those scientists over the last 100 years, and I congratulate it on the occasion of its centennial.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 459) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

The resolutions (S. Res. 460 and S. Res. 461) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COMBATING GLOBAL CORRUPTION ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 144, S. 1309.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1309) to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to assess United States assistance to designated countries in order to advance anti-corruption efforts in those countries and better serve United States taxpayers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which

had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CORRUPT ACTOR.**—The term “corrupt actor” means—

(A) any foreign person or entity that is a government official or government entity responsible for, or complicit in, an act of public corruption; and

(B) any company, in which a person or entity described in subparagraph (A) has a significant stake, which is responsible for, or complicit in, an act of public corruption.

(2) **FOREIGN ASSISTANCE.**—The term “foreign assistance” means assistance made available under—

(A) the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.); or

(B) the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.).

(3) **GRAND CORRUPTION.**—The term “grand corruption” means public corruption committed at a high level of government that—

(A) distorts policies or the central functioning of the country; and

(B) enables leaders to benefit at the expense of the public good.

(4) **PETTY CORRUPTION.**—The term “petty corruption” means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain by low- or mid-level public officials in their interactions with ordinary citizens, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

(5) **PUBLIC CORRUPTION.**—The term “public corruption” means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the foreign policy interest of the United States to help other countries promote good governance and combat public corruption, particularly grand corruption;

(2) multiple departments and agencies across the United States Government operate programs that promote good governance in foreign countries and enhance foreign countries' ability to combat public corruption;

(3) the Department of State should promote coordination among programs described in paragraph (2) to improve their effectiveness and efficiency; and

(4) the Department of State should identify areas in which United States efforts to help other countries promote good governance and combat public corruption could be enhanced.

SEC. 3. ANNUAL REPORT.

The Secretary shall annually submit to the appropriate congressional committees and publish, on a publicly accessible website, a report that—

(1) groups foreign countries, by quintile, based on—

(A) the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator on Control of Corruption; and

(B) the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator on Voice and Accountability;

(2) adds context and commentary, as appropriate, to the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator on Control of Corruption and the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator on Voice and Accountability groupings under paragraph (1), as appropriate, based on the factors outlined in section 4;

(3) describes, based on the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators and the factors outlined in section 4, the status of foreign governments' efforts to combat public corruption; and

(4) describes the status of each foreign country's active membership in voluntary multi-sectoral global governance initiatives as evidence of the country's government-led efforts to combat public corruption.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL FACTORS FOR ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT PUBLIC CORRUPTION.

(a) **FACTORS FOR ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT PUBLIC CORRUPTION.**—In assessing a government's efforts to combat public corruption, the Secretary of State should consider, to the extent reliable information is available—

(1) whether the country—

(A) has enacted laws and established government structures, policies, and practices that prohibit public corruption, including grand corruption and petty corruption; and

(B) enforces such laws through a fair judicial process;

(2) whether the country prescribes appropriate punishment for grand corruption that is commensurate with the punishment prescribed for serious crimes;

(3) whether the country prescribes appropriate punishment for petty corruption that provides a sufficiently stringent deterrent and adequately reflects the nature of the offense;

(4) the extent to which the government of the country—

(A) vigorously investigates and prosecutes acts of public corruption; and

(B) convicts and sentences persons responsible for such acts that take place wholly or partly within such country, including, as appropriate, requiring the incarceration of individuals convicted of such acts;

(5) the extent to which the government of the country vigorously investigates, prosecutes, convicts, and sentences public officials who participate in or facilitate public corruption, including nationals of the country who are deployed in foreign military assignments, trade delegations abroad, or other similar missions who engage in or facilitate severe forms of public corruption;

(6) the extent to which the government of the country has adopted measures to prevent public corruption, such as measures to inform and educate the public, including potential victims, about the causes and consequences of public corruption;

(7) steps taken by the government of the country to prohibit government officials from participating in, facilitating, or condoning public corruption, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of such officials;

(8) the extent to which the country government provides access, or, as appropriate, makes adequate resources available, to civil society organizations and other institutions to combat public corruption, including reporting, investigating, and monitoring;

(9) the extent to which an independent judiciary or judicial body in the country is responsible for, and effectively capable of, deciding public corruption cases impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with the law, without any improper restrictions, influences, inducements, pressures, threats, or interferences (direct or indirect) from any source or for any reason;

(10) the extent to which the government of the country is assisting in international investigations of transnational public corruption networks and in other cooperative efforts to combat grand corruption, including cooperating with the governments of other countries to extradite corrupt actors;

(11) the extent to which the government of the country recognizes the rights of victims of public corruption, ensures their access to justice, and takes steps to prevent victims from being further victimized or persecuted by corrupt actors, government officials, or others;

(12) the extent to which the government of the country refrains from prosecuting legitimate victims of public corruption or whistleblowers due to such persons having assisted in exposing public corruption, and refrains from other discriminatory treatment of such persons; and

(13) such other information relating to public corruption as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

SEC. 5. DESIGNATION OF EMBASSY ANTI-CORRUPTION POINTS OF CONTACT.

(a) **DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.**—The Secretary of State shall annually designate an anti-corruption point of contact at the United States Mission to each country that he or she determines is in need of such a point of contact.

(b) **POINTS OF CONTACT DUTIES.**—Each designated anti-corruption point of contact shall be responsible for coordinating a whole-of-government approach to combating public corruption in his or her posted country among relevant United States Government departments or agencies with a presence in that country, including, as applicable, the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Homeland Security, and the United States Agency for International Development.

(c) **TRAINING.**—The Secretary of State shall develop and implement appropriate training for designated anti-corruption points of contact.

(d) **INTERNAL REPORTING.**—Each anti-corruption point of contact shall submit an annual report to the Secretary regarding anti-corruption activities within his or her posted country that—

(1) evaluates the effectiveness of current programs that promote good governance and have an effect of combating public corruption; and

(2) identifies areas in which the United States Government's approach could be enhanced, including specific programs that could be used to enhance the whole-of-government approach.

SEC. 6. INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall have primary responsibility for managing a whole-of-government effort to improve coordination among United States Government departments and agencies that have a role in promoting good governance in foreign countries and enhancing foreign countries' ability to combat public corruption.

(b) **TASK FORCE.**—

(1) **INITIAL MEETING.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall establish and convene an initial meeting of an interagency task force, which shall be composed of—

(A) representatives appointed by the President from the departments and agency listed in section 5(b); and

(B) representatives from any other United States Government departments or agencies, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **ADDITIONAL MEETINGS.**—The task force described in paragraph (1) shall meet not less frequently than twice per year.

(c) **TASK FORCE DUTIES.**—The task force established pursuant to subsection (b) shall—

(1) assist the Secretary of State in managing the whole-of-government effort described in subsection (a);

(2) evaluate, on a general basis, the effectiveness of current programs that have an effect of combating public corruption;

(3) identify general areas in which the United States Government's approach could be enhanced; and

(4) identify specific programs for specific countries that could be used to enhance the whole-of-government approach.

SEC. 7. TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after publishing the report required under section 3, and prior to obligation by any United States agency of foreign assistance to the government of a country ranked in the lowest 2 quintiles in the World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicator on Control of Corruption grouping described in section 3(1), the Secretary, in coordination with the Administrator of USAID, as appropriate, shall—

(1) conduct a corruption risk assessment and create a corruption mitigation strategy for all United States foreign assistance programs in that country;

(2) require the inclusion of anti-corruption clauses for all foreign assistance contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, which allow for the termination of the contract, grant, or cooperative agreement without penalty if credible indicators of public corruption are discovered;

(3) require the inclusion of appropriate clawback clauses for all foreign assistance that has been misappropriated through corruption;

(4) require the appropriate disclosure to the United States Government, in confidential form, if necessary, of the beneficial ownership of contractors, subcontractors, grantees, cooperative agreement participants, and other organizations receiving funding from the United States Government for foreign assistance programs; and

(5) establish a mechanism for investigating allegations of misappropriated foreign assistance funds or equipment.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS AND WAIVER.**—

(1) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to humanitarian assistance, disaster assistance, or assistance to combat corruption.

(2) **WAIVER.**—The Secretary of State may waive the requirement to delay foreign assistance under subsection (a) if the Secretary certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such waiver is important to the national security interests of the United States.

SEC. 8. RESOURCES AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that outlines the resources needed to meet the objectives of this Act, including—

(A) personnel needs; and

(B) a description of the bureaucratic structure of the offices within the Department of State and USAID that are engaged in anti-corruption activities.

(b) **ANNUAL BRIEFING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the implementation of this Act, including—

(A) the designation of anti-corruption points of contact for countries under section 5(a);

(B) the training implemented under section 5(c);

(C) the reports received from anti-corruption points of contact under section 5(d);

(D) the management of the whole-of-government effort to improve coordination under section 6(a);

(E) the establishment of the task force under section 6(b); and

(F) the activities of the task force under section 6(c).

(2) **FORM OF BRIEFING.**—The briefings under subsection (b) shall be conducted on an in-person basis to members or staff of the appropriate congressional committees. Portions of the briefings may be conducted in a classified setting, as needed.

(c) **ONLINE PLATFORM.**—The Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator shall consolidate existing reports with anti-corruption components into one online, public platform, which shall—

(1) include—

(A) the Human Rights Report;

(B) the Fiscal Transparency Report;

(C) the Investment Climate Statement reports;

(D) the International Narcotics Control Strategy Report; and

(E) any other relevant public reports;

(2) link to third-party indicators and compliance mechanisms used by the United States Government to inform policy and programming, such as—

(A) the International Finance Corporation's Doing Business surveys;

(B) the International Budget Partnership's Open Budget Index; and

(C) *multilateral peer review anti-corruption compliance mechanisms, such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Working Group on Bribery in International Business Transactions and the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, done at New York October 31, 2003, to further highlight expert international views on country challenges and country efforts.*

(d) *TRAINING.—The Secretary of State and the USAID Administrator shall incorporate anti-corruption components into existing Foreign Service and Civil Service training courses—*

(1) *to increase the ability of Department of State and USAID personnel to support anti-corruption as a foreign policy and development priority; and*

(2) *to strengthen their ability to design, implement, and evaluate more effective anti-corruption programming around the world, including enhancing skills to better evaluate and mitigate public corruption risks in assistance programs.*

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we need to pass the Combating Global Corruption Act. Today, I join with my colleague Senator YOUNG to reaffirm bipartisan support for this important legislation.

Corruption threatens international stability and security and poses a serious threat to democracy and democratic values. Ten days ago, December 9, was International AntiCorruption Day. This day provides an annual reminder of the dire need to prioritize combatting corruption here in the United States and around the world.

Corruption undermines democratic institutions, it compromises the rule of law, and it erodes human rights protections. It damages America's global competitiveness and hampers economic growth in global markets. It fosters the conditions for violent extremism and weakens institutions associated with governance and accountability. These are direct threats to our national and international security.

Earlier this year, Transparency International published its Corruption Perceptions Index for 2018. It underscored that the failure to curb corruption is contributing to a worldwide crisis of democracy. Not surprisingly then, Freedom House similarly reported that 2018 was marked by global declines in political rights and civil liberties for the 13th consecutive year. Sixty-eight countries suffered net declines in political rights and civil liberties during 2018, with only 50 nations registering gains.

We have all seen the headlines in recent years—from scandals in Liberia, Hungary, and Guatemala, to the doping by Russian athletes and their subsequent ban from the 2016 Summer Olympics and using aid to influence other nations' behavior.

It is clear that where there are high levels of corruption, we find fragile states, authoritarian states, or states suffering from internal or external conflict—in places such as Lebanon, Afghanistan and Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Somalia, Nigeria, and Sudan.

Different domestic issues may have sparked the wave of massive protests we are observing today—whether they be increases in gas prices or metro

fares—but many of these uprisings have been sustained by public desire to weed out leaders' corruption. Corruption is no longer being tolerated or excused.

Corruption operates via extensive and entrenched networks in both the public and private sectors. It is ubiquitous and pervasive, but we must address it. The costs of not addressing it or rooting it out are just too great.

Mr. President, we must be clear-eyed—any fight against corruption will be long-term and difficult. It is a fight against powerful people, powerful companies, and powerful interests. It is about changing a mindset and a culture as much as it is about establishing and enforcing laws.

While previous anti-corruption legislation has been crucial, the Combating Global Corruption Act takes our commitment to this value further by bringing a whole-of-government approach to the issue and bringing more transparency to the instances of corruption going on unnoticed in every country around the world.

The Combating Global Corruption Act requires the State Department to produce an annual assessment, either by a briefing or by a report, similar to the Trafficking in Persons Report, which takes a close look at each country's efforts to combat corruption. The assessment will measure indicators such as transparency, accountability, enforcement of anti-corruption laws, and the extent to which public power is used for private gain.

That model, which has effectively advanced the effort to combat modern-day slavery, will similarly embed the issue of corruption in our collective work and make other nations more conscious of their corruption levels.

The bill includes clear definitions of corruption and corrupt activities and underscores the importance of prioritizing corruption into strategic planning—across our agencies, bureaus, and our missions overseas.

It specifically increases coordination on anti-corruption efforts between the Department of State and USAID and formally engages our embassies in the fight against corruption by establishing anti-corruption points of contact at our Embassies in critical countries.

We work across multiple agencies and in multiple offices to combat corruption. The roles of these points of contact, comprised of either the chief of mission or personnel designated for the role by the chief of mission, will foster greater coordination on anticorruption efforts within the U.S. government.

It is time for the U.S. Congress to send a strong message to our Nation and to the world that corruption cannot be accepted as the status quo.

It is time that we back up our words—our commitment to supporting democratization, human rights, and fairness globally—with action to protect those critically important values.

Let's pass the Combating Global Corruption Act.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; that the Cardin substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1275), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

The bill (S. 1309), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL ONE HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 462, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 462) designating January 2020 as "National One Health Awareness Month" to promote awareness of organizations focused on public health, animal health, and environmental health collaboration throughout the United States and to recognize the critical contributions of those organizations to the future of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 462) was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3148

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand is there a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3148) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills for the joint resolutions through Monday, December 23, 2019.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, and in consultation with the Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the appointment of the following individuals to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: Roy Kamphausen of Connecticut for a term expiring December 31, 2021 (reappointment); the Honorable James M. Talent of Missouri for a term expiring December 31, 2021 (reappointment).

The Chair announces, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, and in consultation with the Ranking Members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: The Honorable Carte P. Goodwin of West Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2020 and expiring December 31, 2021 (reappointment).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 548.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Sean O'Donnell, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no in-

tervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motion be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the O'Donnell nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 507, 508, and 509.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Dana S. Deasy, of Virginia, to be Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense (New Position); Lisa W. Hershman, of Indiana, to be Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense; and Robert John Sander, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Deasy, Hershman, and Sander nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2019, THROUGH THURSDAY, JANUARY 2, 2020

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, December 23, at 10 a.m.; Thursday, December 26, at 3:15 p.m.; Monday, December 30, at 2 p.m.; and Thursday, January 2 at 6:30 p.m.

For the information of all Senators, when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, January 2, 2020, it will next convene at 12 noon on Friday, January 3, pursuant to the Constitution; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day. Finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:47 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 8:34 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Executive Session for the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive calendar 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, and 411.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, that no further motions be in order, and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nomination 525 be removed from the list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of David T. Fischer, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of

America to the Kingdom of Morocco; Morse H. Tan, of Illinois, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Criminal Justice; Roxanne Cabral, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Marshall Islands; Kelley Eckels Currie, of Georgia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues; Leslie Meredith Tsou, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sultanate of Oman; Yuri Kim, of Guam, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Albania; Carmen G. Cantor, of Puerto Rico, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federated States of Micronesia; Robert S. Gilchrist, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lithuania; Alina L. Romanowski, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the State of Kuwait; Kelly C. Degnan, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Georgia; Peter M. Haymond, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Lao People's Democratic Republic; Michelle A. Bekkering, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, en bloc.

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

NOMINATIONS IN STATUS QUO

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I send a list of nominations to the desk and ask that they be kept in status quo despite the sine die adjournment of the 1st session of the 116th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations in status quo are as follows:

NOMINATIONS IN STATUS QUO BY COMMITTEE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Cal. #238—Mindy Brashears, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Food Safety.

Cal. #368—Scott Soles, of Texas, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Military:

PN 1223—Nicholas W. DiGeorge to be Lieutenant Commander.

PN 1224—Colin R. Young to be Lieutenant Commander.

PN 1262—Shaun J. Arredondo to be Major.

PN 1263—Steven K. Uhlman to be Major.

PN 1292—Christopher M. Feroli to be Major.

Civilian:

PN 1277—Elaine A. McCusker, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

PN 1322—James E. McPherson, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

PN 1310—Charles Williams, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Cal. #506—Thomas A. Summers, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2020.

Cal. #505—Jessie Hill Roberson, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2023. (Reappointment)

Cal. #504—Joseph Bruce Hamilton, of Texas, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2022.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Cal. #546—John Bobbitt, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

PN 1153—Peter J. Coniglio, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Export-Import Bank.

Cal. #547—Brian D. Montgomery, of Texas, to be Deputy Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

PN 612—Nazak Nikakhtar, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security.

Exec. No. 500—Bruce Poliquin, of Maine, to be a Director of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for a term expiring December 31, 2021.

PN 701—Paul Shmotolokha, of Washington, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2021.

Exec. Cal. #545—Mitchell A. Silk, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

PN 56—Claudia Slacik, of New York, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2023.

PN 1034—David Carey Woll, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Cal. #369—Michelle A. Schultz, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Surface Transportation Board for the term of five years.

Coast Guard:

PN 1182—Capt. Miriam L. Lafferty to be Rear Admiral (Lower Half).

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

PN 857—Andrew George Biggs, of Oregon, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for

the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 858—Jose Baldomero Carrion, of Puerto Rico, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 859—Carlos M. Garcia, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 860—Arthur J. Gonzalez, of New York, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 861—Jose R. Gonzalez, of New York, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 862—Ana Matosantos, of California, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 863—David Skeel, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Financial Oversight and Management Board for Puerto Rico for the remainder of the term expiring August 30, 2019. (New Position)

PN 1246—Lanny Erdos, of Ohio, to be Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Cal. #453—Katherine Andrea Lemos, of California, to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

Cal. #451—Katherine Andrea Lemos, of California, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

*PN 1247 (will be HSGAC) Robert J. Feitel, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

PN 1159—Kipp Kranbuhl, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

PN 1278—Alina I. Marshall, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

PN 1279—Christian N. Weiler, of Louisiana, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

PN 1248—Sarah C. Arbes, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

PN 85—James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

PN 84—James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

PN 83—James B. Lockhart III, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for a term of four years.

PN 82—Jason J. Fichtner, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Social Security Advisory Board for a term expiring September 30, 2024.

Cal. #416—Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Cal No. 549 Sung Y. Kim, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of

the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

PN 1035—Natalie E. Brown, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Uganda.

PN 1249—Todd C. Chapman, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil.

PN 1296—Jason Myung-Ik Chung, of Virginia, to be United States Director of the Asian Development Bank, with the rank of Ambassador.

PN 1045—Sandra E. Clark, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Burkina Faso.

PN 1280—J. Steven Dowd, of Florida, to be United States Director of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

PN 1161—John Hennessey-Niland, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Palau.

PN 1229—Joseph Manso, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as United States Representative to the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

PN 1231—Dorothy Shea, of North Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Lebanese Republic.

PN 1281—Henry T. Wooster, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

PN 1164—Donald Wright, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Republic of Tanzania.

PN 1037—Steven Christopher Koutsis, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Chad.

Exec. Cal. No. 216 Charles L. Glazer, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2020.

Cal. #531—Andeliz N. Castillo, of New York States Alternate Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank.

Cal. #525—Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

Cal. #541—Cynthia L. Attwood, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for a term expiring April 27, 2025. (Reappointment)

Cal. #542—Amanda Wood Laihow, of Maine, to be a Member of Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission for the remainder of a term expiring April 27, 2023.

Cal. #552—Crosby Kemper III, of Missouri, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services for a term of four years.

Cal. #69—Charles Wickser Banta, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Cal. #74—Michelle Itczak, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2020.

Cal. #76—Barbara Coleen Long, of Missouri, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

Cal. #78—Carleton Varney, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Cal. #60—Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2021.

Cal. #340—B. Chad Bungard, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2025.

Cal. #339—Troy D. Edgar, of California, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security.

PN 798—Elizabeth J. Shapiro, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

PN 1048—Rahkel Bouchet, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

PN 1283—Mark A. Robbins, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

PN 1284—Carl Ezekiel Ross, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Exec. Cal. 554—Paul J. Ray, of Tennessee, to be Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget.

Cal. #61—Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board for the term of seven years expiring March 1, 2023.

Cal. #62—Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board.

Cal. #498—Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

PN 1153—Peter J. Coniglio, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Export-Import Bank.

PN 1247—Robert J. Feitel, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

PN 1250—Michael D. Weahkee, of New Mexico, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Cal. #111—William R. Evanina, of Pennsylvania, to be Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

Exec. 555—Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

PN 1109—Grant C. Jaquith, of New York, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims for the term of fifteen years.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Exec. Cal. #329—Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, vice Emily Clark Hewitt, retired.

Exec. Cal. #358—Diane Gujarati, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, vice John Gleeson, resigned.

Exec. Cal. #384—Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years, vice Curtis V. Gomez, term expired.

Exec. Cal. #461—John Fitzgerald Kness, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, vice Samuel DerYeghiayan, retired.

Exec. Cal. #462—Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, vice Mary Ellen Coster Williams, term expired.

Exec. Cal. #491—Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, vice Jay A. Garcia-Gregory, retired.

Exec. Cal. #535—Philip M. Halpern, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, vice P. Kevin Castel, retired.

Exec. Cal. #538—Barbara Bailey Jongbloed, of Connecticut, to be United States District Judge for the District of Connecticut, vice Alvin W. Thompson, retired.

Exec. Cal. #229—Virgil Madden, of Indiana, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of six years, vice Patricia Cushwa, term expired.

Exec. Cal. #372—Monica David Morris, of Florida, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission for a term of six years, vice J. Patricia Wilson Smoot, term expired.

PN 1174—Scott H. Rash, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, vice Cindy K. Jorgenson, retired.

PN 1314—John Charles Hinderaker, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, vice Raner Christercunean Collins, retired.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROMOTING PHYSICAL ACTIVITY FOR AMERICANS ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 286, S. 1608.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1608) to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promoting Physical Activity for Americans Act".

SEC. 2. PHYSICAL ACTIVITY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AMERICANS.

(a) REPORTS.—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than December 31, 2028, and at least every 10 years thereafter, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall publish a report that provides physical activity recommendations for the people of the United States. Each such report shall contain physical activity information and recommendations for consideration and use by the general public, and shall be considered, as applicable and appropriate, by relevant Federal agencies in carrying out relevant Federal health programs.

(2) *BASIS OF RECOMMENDATIONS.*—The information contained in each report required under paragraph (1) shall be based on the most current

evidence-based scientific and medical knowledge at the time the report is prepared, and shall include additional recommendations for population subgroups, such as children or individuals with disabilities, including information regarding engagement in appropriate physical activity and avoiding inactivity.

(3) **UPDATE REPORTS.**—Not later than 5 years after the publication of the first report under paragraph (1), and at least every 10 years thereafter, the Secretary shall publish an updated report detailing evidence-based practices and highlighting continuing issues with respect to physical activity. The contents of reports under this paragraph may focus on a particular group, subsection, or other division of the general public or on a particular issue relating to physical activity.

(b) **INTERACTION WITH OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Federal agencies proposing to issue physical activity recommendations that differ from the recommendations in the most recent report published under subsection (a)(1) shall, as applicable and appropriate, take into consideration the recommendations provided through reports issued under this Act.

(c) **EXISTING AUTHORITY NOT AFFECTED.**—This section is not intended to limit the support of biomedical research by any Federal agency or to limit the presentation or communication of scientific or medical findings or review of such findings by any Federal agency.

(d) **LIMITATION.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no physical fitness standard established under this Act shall be binding on any individual as a matter of Federal law or regulation.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Ms. COLLINS. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1608), as amended, passed.

Ms. COLLINS. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from North Dakota be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
DECEMBER 23, 2019, AT 10 A.M.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:37 p.m., adjourned until Monday, December 23, 2019, at 10 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations by unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHON STEPHEN BELCHER AND ENDING WITH DAVID MANGO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARA MIRIAM ABRAMSON AND ENDING WITH MEGAN ELIZABETH ZUROWSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNY U. ABAMU AND ENDING WITH HAMDA A. YUSUF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019.

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination by unanimous consent and the nomination was confirmed:

THOMAS B. CHAPMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 19, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT J. COLVILLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

LEWIS J. LIMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

MARY KAY VYSKOCIL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

GARY RICHARD BROWN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

STEPHANIE DAWKINS DAVIS, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.

KEA WHETZAL RIGGS, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MICHELLE A. BEKKERING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

THE JUDICIARY

ANURAG SINGHAL, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

KAREN SPENCER MARSTON, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

DANIEL MACK TRAYNOR, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA.

JODI W. DISHMAN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA.

JOHN M. GALLAGHER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

MICHAEL GRAHAM, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2020.

MICHAEL GRAHAM, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2025.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LAJUANA S. WILCHER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL AGRICULTURAL MORTGAGE CORPORATION.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DANA S. DEASY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

LISA W. HERSHMAN, OF INDIANA, TO BE CHIEF MANAGEMENT OFFICER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

ROBERT JOHN SANDER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID T. FISCHER, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF MOROCCO.

MORSE H. TAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

ROXANNE CABRAL, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS.

KELLEY ECKELS CURRIE, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

LESLIE MEREDITH TSOU, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SULTANATE OF OMAN.

YURI KIM, OF GUAM, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ALBANIA.

CARMEN G. CANTOR, OF PUERTO RICO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERATED STATES OF MICRONESIA.

ROBERT S. GILCHRIST, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA.

ALINA L. ROMANOWSKI, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE STATE OF KUWAIT.

KELLY C. DEGNAN, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO GEORGIA.

PETER M. HAYMOND, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

THE JUDICIARY

BERNARD MAURICE JONES II, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SEAN O'DONNELL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

STEPHEN E. BIEGUN, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

J. BRETT BLANTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL FOR THE TERM OF TEN YEARS.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

THOMAS B. CHAPMAN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2023.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHON STEPHEN BELCHER AND ENDING WITH DAVID MANGO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARA MIRIAM ABRAMSON AND ENDING WITH MEGAN ELIZABETH ZUROWSKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNY U. ABAMU AND ENDING WITH HAMDA A. YUSUF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON DECEMBER 2, 2019.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING ENSIGN JOSHUA KALEB
WATSON

HON. MARTHA ROBY

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mrs. ROBY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and sacrifices of Ensign Joshua Kaleb Watson, who was tragically killed on December 6, 2019, at Pensacola Naval Air Station in Florida.

Born and raised in Enterprise, Alabama, Kaleb was a natural leader and devoted servant to his community from an early age. Inspired by his uncle's service in the Gulf War, Kaleb knew at a very early age since childhood that he wanted to serve his country in the military.

Kaleb continued to demonstrate his leadership skills at Enterprise High School, where he participated in JROTC, National Honor Society, French Honor Society, and captain of the rifle team. It was through his experience on the rifle team that he learned of the opportunities at the United States Naval Academy. Kaleb was accepted to attend the prestigious Naval Academy upon graduating from high school in 2014. Kaleb continued to serve his hometown community after graduation by volunteering his time to the rifle team during school breaks.

At the Naval Academy, Kaleb set his sights on becoming a Navy pilot, and he excelled. A dedicated student, Kaleb majored in mechanical engineering and was named to the Dean's list and Commandant's Honors list. Outside of the classroom, he was a member of the Academy's rifle team, served as a wrestling coach, and was a small-arms instructor. Under his leadership as captain of the rifle team, the Naval Academy won its first victory over West Point in a decade.

After commissioning, Kaleb served a temporary assignment at the Naval Academy's Physical Education department until last month, when he reported to Pensacola to begin flight training. On December 6, Kaleb made the ultimate sacrifice for his country when an active shooter opened fire at the Naval Air Station. Without hesitation, Kaleb sprang into action. After being wounded himself, Kaleb was able to locate first responders to identify the shooter, undoubtedly preventing many more casualties that day.

Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to join the people of Alabama's Second Congressional District, the Enterprise community, and the Watson family to honor Kaleb today. He is remembered by his peers and many others as a kind friend, encouraging teammate, and generous volunteer. Kaleb died a hero, and his courageous actions and service to this nation will not soon be forgotten as we continue to share his story of selflessness and valor. May God bless his family and community as we mourn the loss of Joshua Kaleb Watson, and may God bless all of our military members who continue to defend and protect the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING DYLAN M. GOETSCH
AND CHRISTOPHER W. SCHMOKER

HON. DUSTY JOHNSON

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Dylan M. Goetsch and Christopher W. Schmoker for their tremendous courage last year while saving a citizen from a house fire in Sturgis, South Dakota.

After arriving at the scene of a burning home in May 2018, police Officer Dylan Goetsch and Sgt. Christopher Schmoker rushed into the house without hesitation, knowing Jason McKee was trapped inside. They journeyed to the upper level of the home not once, not twice, but three times in search of the trapped man. The smoke was so dense, Officer Goetsch was unable to see more than a few feet in front of him, but they did not retreat until they were able to drag Mr. McKee to safety.

I was pleased to hear Officer Goetsch and Sgt. Schmoker are being awarded the Carnegie Medal by the Carnegie Hero Fund in honor of their bravery. This award is reserved for individuals who risk their lives to an extraordinary degree in the attempt to save the lives of others. I can think of no citizens more deserving of this award than Officer Goetsch and Sgt. Schmoker.

I thank both these South Dakotans for their selfless courage. Our state and country are better because of citizens like them. I commend them for their outstanding heroism and congratulate them on the receipt of the esteemed Carnegie Medal.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF BENNETTSVILLE, SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of Bennettsville, South Carolina and its 200th Anniversary.

The City of Bennettsville was founded on December 14, 1819 in Marlborough District on the Great Pee Dee River. Named after Thomas Bennett Jr., the 48th Governor of South Carolina, the city was formally chartered on December 20, 1866 and incorporated on March 4, 1976.

Since its founding, agriculture has been the number one revenue source in and around Bennettsville. Agricultural products of Bennettsville include grain, indigo, cotton, tobacco, corn, peanuts, timber, fruits and vegetables, as well as the raising of cattle, poultry,

and swine. Agritourism and agritainment have evolved from the stable agriculture industry.

Upon its founding, the South Carolina General Assembly authorized the construction of a new courthouse, designed by South Carolina architect Robert Mills. The Mills courthouse was replaced in 1852. The following courthouse was headquarters of the 17th Army Corps of the Army of the United States and one of the few county seats holding records dating back to 1785. The current courthouse was built in 1884.

Madam Speaker, I honor all that have worked to make the City of Bennettsville a symbol of American grace and charm and recognize its 200th Anniversary.

CONGRATULATING DUBLIN HIGH SCHOOL ON WINNING THE FOOTBALL STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. RICK W. ALLEN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. ALLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Dublin High School Fighting Irish on winning the Georgia High School Association 2A Football State Championship.

These young men have worked hard all season, and this weekend's big win is a result of all their work. While at halftime the Fighting Irish were down, they quickly came back in the second half to ultimately defeat Brooks County 42 to 32—demonstrating the true meaning of perseverance.

This was a unique win, as not one pass was attempted during the game. But the team won after rushing 437 yards, bringing Dublin its first state title since 2006.

I have no doubt this program will continue to be successful in the years to come, and I look forward to seeing all these young men will accomplish, both on and off the field.

Congratulations to Coach Roger Holmes, the team, and the entire Fighting Irish community.

HONORING THE EXEMPLARY LIFE AND SERVICE OF MAYOR RICHARD GORDON HATCHER

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, it is with deep sadness and the greatest respect that I take this time to remember one of Indiana's most distinguished citizens, the Honorable Richard Gordon Hatcher, who served the City of Gary with the utmost distinction. On Friday, December 13, 2019, Mayor Hatcher passed away at the age of 86. Mayor Hatcher's selfless and lifelong commitment to serving the people of Gary, and his dedication to the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

cause of civil rights and advancing racial equality in all of our communities and throughout the nation, is to be admired and emulated. He will be profoundly missed by his family, friends, co-workers, and the many grateful constituents whose lives he touched.

Richard Hatcher was born on July 10, 1933, in Michigan City, Indiana. He graduated from Indiana University and went on to earn his Juris Doctor degree from Valparaiso University in 1959. Following law school, Mayor Hatcher settled in Gary, Indiana. He practiced at a private firm and went on to serve as a deputy county prosecutor. In 1963, Mayor Hatcher was elected to the Gary City Council. In this position, he helped to pass an open housing law, which ended the practice that forced African Americans to live primarily in the city's midtown section due to restrictive property contracts. In 1967, Richard Gordon Hatcher was elected Mayor of Gary, Indiana, and in doing so became one of the first two African Americans in our nation's history to become mayor of a large city.

Throughout his twenty-year tenure, Mayor Hatcher was unwavering and passionate in his efforts to advocate for civil rights, economic justice, and equality for all Gary residents and citizens of the United States. In particular, Mayor Hatcher devoted substantial efforts to supporting those most in need in his city. For example, he was successful in securing funding for low-cost and public housing in Gary, and he worked to enhance the availability of job training so that every citizen could have the opportunity to meet their own potential and provide for their family. In addition, Mayor Hatcher repaved Gary roads, brought garbage collection services to inner-city neighborhoods for the first time, and oversaw the construction and completion of major projects such as the Genesis Convention Center and the Adam J. Benjamin Transportation Center. On the national front, Mayor Hatcher rose to serve as a political trailblazer for the African American community. He was instrumental in organizing the 1972 National Black Political Convention in Gary, and he also served as chairman of Rev. Jesse Jackson's presidential campaign in 1984, as well as his vice chairman four years later. Mayor Hatcher's contributions to the City of Gary, throughout Northwest Indiana, and beyond are remarkable and immeasurable, and he is to be honored and commended for his tireless action.

Mayor Hatcher is survived by his amazing wife, Ruthellyn, three beloved daughters, Ragen, Rachelle, and Renee, and six beautiful grandchildren. He also leaves to cherish his memory many dear friends and family members and a saddened but grateful community.

Madam Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in paying tribute to a true public servant, Mayor Richard Gordon Hatcher. For his tremendous contributions to the cause of civil rights, and for his dedication to the City of Gary and the community of Northwest Indiana, Mayor Hatcher is worthy of the highest praise. I thank him for his perseverance, sacrifice, and struggle. His legacy will serve as a timeless inspiration for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING THE IRWIN COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL TEAM

HON. AUSTIN SCOTT

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Irwin County High School football team from Ocilla, Georgia on their win against Marion County in the Class A Georgia State Championship on Saturday, December 14, 2019.

With an impressive 56–14 win over the Marion County Eagles, the Indians football team finished their season undefeated (13–0) for the first time since 1975 and brought home the state title. This is the fifth time in six seasons that Head Coach Buddy Nobles has led the Indians to the state finals, all while battling Stage 4 stomach cancer. He called this team a “team of destiny” and there is no doubt his leadership and fighting spirit inspired Irwin County to bring home another state football title to Georgia's Eighth Congressional District.

I want to congratulate the Indians, Coach Nobles, and the entire football and athletics staff at Irwin County High School for this accomplishment.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IN POLICING

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to congratulate four law enforcement officers of the Prince William County Police Department who have been awarded the Attorney General's Award for Distinguished Service in Policing by the United States Department of Justice. These officers have been selected by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services for their bravery and commitment to service. Only 19 law enforcement professionals from across the country have been selected to receive this award this year, and to be recognized by the Department of Justice is a distinct honor that brings pride to the Prince William County Police Department and the communities that these officers protect.

Throughout their careers, these officers have bravely placed themselves in the line of danger. It takes a tremendous amount of courage and character to step into high-risk situations, qualities that these honorees exhibit in abundance. In November of 2018, the Prince William County Police Department received an emergency call reporting an active shooter. Upon arriving to the scene, these officers took immediate action to warn incoming units while taking cover from gunfire. The shooter, who was on the roof, ignored commands to surrender and was eventually struck and fell to the ground. Overcoming their fear of a possible second gunman, the officers exposed themselves to extract the shooter for medical treatment and also pulled a civilian from a residence to safety. The bravery and heroism displayed that day represents true courage and went far above and beyond the line of duty.

It is my honor to recognize the following recipients of the Third Annual Attorney General's Award for Distinguished Service in Policing:

Officer Evan Jurgenson
Officer Nicholas Kelly
Officer Rachel Mynier
Officer John Yenchak

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me once again in honoring these individuals for their bravery and dedication and in thanking them for their selfless service. The importance of their vital roles in protecting the safety of our neighborhoods cannot be overstated and is truly worthy of our highest praise.

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. WILLIAM H. LEE

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of beloved Sacramento Observer founder and publisher, Dr. William Hanford Lee, who passed away on September 22, 2019 at the age of 83. His legacy will live on through the love of his family and friends, as well as the Sacramento Observer, a lighthouse for Sacramento's African-American community. Dr. Lee was blessed with the support of his family, his wife Kathryn (deceased) and sons, Larry, Billy and Roderick (deceased).

Dr. William Lee was born on May 29, 1936 in Austin, Texas. In the early 1940's, Dr. Lee moved to the Sacramento neighborhood of Del Paso Heights. As a young adult, he attended California State University, Sacramento and later transferred to University of California, Berkeley, where he received his B.A. in Accounting. His brief employment with real-estate companies Aerojet and IBM Corporations inspired Dr. Lee to establish his own real-estate and land development company in 1960. His success in real estate allowed for the establishment of The Sacramento Observer on November 22, 1962, marking the beginning of a revolution in journalism.

Several momentous achievements outline Dr. Lee's career: he was awarded an Honorary Ph.D. from Southeastern University in 1970, he was named “Publisher of the Year” by the West Coast Black Publisher's Association in 1985, his newspaper has been named No.1 Black Newspaper six times, and he was awarded the John B. Russwurm trophy, the United States' top newspaper publishing honor. Additionally, he was co-founder and former President of the Men's Civic League, co-founder of The Greater Sacramento Urban League, and co-founder of the Sacramento Area Black Caucus. Nationally, Dr. Lee served on the Board of Directors and as an officer for the National Newspapers Publisher's Association, the Black Press of America, and co-founded the West Coast Black Publisher's Association. These incredible achievements and roles certainly signify just how powerful William Lee's presence was in the Sacramento region, in California, and in our nation.

Madam Speaker, today we honor Dr. William Hanford Lee's generous contributions to journalism and education; he has been a mentor, an advocate, and a leader—both locally and nationally. His efforts in providing representation for the African-American community will be remembered for a life-time.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PERMIT COMMERCIAL FILMING AND PHOTOGRAPHY ON THE GROUNDS OF THE U.S. CAPITOL

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I introduce a bill that would permit commercial filming and photography on the grounds of the U.S. Capitol, beyond east of Union Square, the only area where such filming is currently authorized. This bill would permit commercial filming and photography outside of the Capitol and congressional office buildings by permit, so long as both the House and Senate are not in session. In many countries worldwide, freedom of expression is limited. Our country should be the first to encourage commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, a symbol of U.S. democracy at work. Commercial filmmakers should not have to go to other cities or fake capitol buildings for movies and films about the Capitol.

The current policy permitting filming near the United States Botanic Garden shows that Capitol Police can handle filmmaking on Capitol grounds, especially when Congress is not in session, as my bill would provide. However, filming from that vantage point captures the least familiar view of the Capitol. Keeping filmmakers from standing in front of the Capitol is neither business-friendly nor true to the nation's democratic traditions. Encouraging commercial filming and photography at the Capitol would help spread the story of our national legislature around the world. The time is overdue to allow commercial filming and photography of the exterior of the historic 19th-century Capitol.

There is no good reason why commercial filming and photography should be confined to Union Square. Specifically, my bill would give Capitol Police complete discretion to issue a permit authorizing commercial filming and photography under the same conditions as those in Union Square. No policy or security reason exists to justify limiting commercial filming and photography of the Capitol complex to only one location, Union Square, especially considering that permits are necessary. Visitors are regularly seen on East Capitol Street (east of 2nd Street) taking pictures, where they get a full view of the Capitol building, demonstrating the arbitrary nature of limiting commercial filming and photography to Union Square.

This bill would also provide Capitol Police the authority to charge fees to cover any costs incurred by the Architect of the Capitol resulting from permit approval, to be deposited into the Capitol Trust Account. The Capitol Trust Account was established to accept proceeds from any fees collected for commercial filming and photography permits for Union Square. Amounts in the Capitol Trust Account would be available without fiscal year limitation for maintenance, improvements and projects as the Architect of the Capitol considers appropriate, subject to the approval of the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Views of the Capitol are among America's most iconic. Limiting commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, an important vehicle for telling the nation's story, does not serve

the American people. Indeed, most of the world reveres our system of government largely through commercial films and photos of the Capitol, a symbol of our democracy at work. Commercial films and photographs of the Capitol, the seat of our democracy, are perhaps the best modern vehicles for telling the nation's story and showcasing its democratic system of government. Republicans and Democrats alike revere the image of the Capitol as a symbol of patriotism. My bill would enable appropriate, permitted commercial filming and photography of the Capitol, and would create economic benefits for the nation, the District of Columbia, and private business.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

IP PROVISIONS FALLING SHORT IN USMCA

HON. THEODORE E. DEUTCH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, despite the new provisions intended to protect working families and support various industries in the USMCA, there is one very important group that has been left behind—authors, artists, and other creators.

America's arts and entertainment industry is an important economic engine, with motion pictures and television alone accounting for \$17.2 billion in annual U.S. exports, representing 2.5 times the level of imports. It's also an important medium to share and celebrate American history, values and culture with the world, to lift up overlooked stories, and to bring us together. So, it is unfortunate that the USMCA includes a provision that makes it harder for working families in this industry to make a fair return on their work.

That provision is Article 20.89 (Legal Remedies and Safe Harbors). Article 20.89 (Legal Remedies and Safe Harbors) should be excluded from future trade deals. It potentially allows online service providers to profit from copyright infringement to which they turn a blind eye. Article 20.89 is styled after Section 512 of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) known as the copyright safe harbor provision.

Section 512 of DMCA became law in 1998, and to some, it seemed a good idea at the time—a way to help an infant industry grow. But after several bad court cases and technological advances, Section 512 minimizes the responsibility of the big internet platforms to cooperate with rights holders to protect their livelihoods. That infant industry is now one of the world's biggest. And Section 512 undermines creative professionals instead of supporting them and enriches the big internet platforms at the expense of competitors who do not enjoy the same loophole.

Today, the web consists of more than 6 billion pages, and on a high-speed connection, it takes less than a minute to download a high definition movie. Illegal streaming, illegal downloading, and other forms of online piracy cost an estimated \$29.2 billion and \$71.0 billion annually to the U.S. economy. Our trade agreements should help us combat international copyright theft instead of locking in a giant loophole that tilts the playing field against creative professionals.

Section 512 has been under review by the Copyright Office since 2015, with a report expected soon.

Congress should insist that Section 512-style rules should be omitted from future trade deals.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

STATEMENT FOR RECORD ON IMPEACHMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. SALUD O. CARBAJAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. CARBAJAL. Madam Speaker, while none of us came to Congress to impeach a president, the evidence against Donald Trump has become abundantly clear. The president used the power of his office to solicit foreign interference from Ukraine into our elections, he attempted to withhold congressionally approved military aid to advance that request and he undermined our national security, all for his personal political benefit. Moreover, he directed his administration to defy congressional subpoenas to try to obstruct our investigation into his wrongdoing.

These actions run counter to the oath that presidents make to uphold our Constitution. These actions are a direct threat to the security of our democracy.

When I joined the Marine Corps, I swore an oath to our nation. As a member of Congress, I made that promise again. I will vote to impeach because all of us who hold public office take an oath to defend the Constitution—the president has abused this responsibility, but I refuse to do the same.

December 18, 2019 will be remembered as a serious and somber day in the U.S. House, but it is also a day where my colleagues and I made good on our oaths to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

COMMENDING KURT ERICKSON FOR HIS 20 YEARS OF SERVICE WITH WRAP

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize my friend, Kurt Erickson, and to commend him for his 20 years of service with the Washington Regional Alcohol Project (WRAP) and his dedication to the elimination of impaired driving and underage drinking in the Washington metropolitan area.

WRAP is a public-private partnership that works with law enforcement, community stakeholders, and advocacy groups in Northern Virginia, Washington, DC, and Maryland. Kurt serves as President and CEO of WRAP and it is not an exaggeration to say that he is the driving force of the program. For two decades,

he has spearheaded public and government relations efforts in the DMV area. Kurt has been named Legislative Chairman of the Maryland Impaired Driving Coalition, an appointee by the Governor to the Virginia's Task Force to Combat the Influence of Drugs and Alcohol and has served on multiple boards and associations.

Among his many duties, Kurt oversees the SoberRide Program which provides free and discounted rides home during the holidays. This program is considered one of the most successful programs of its kind in the nation. Kurt has Chaired the Checkpoint Strikeforce for the last 18 years, working with local and state law enforcement to get impaired drivers off the roads. WRAP also has aggressive outreach programs for adults as well as youth and provides multi-media presentations and school resource guides.

In recognition of his years of service and dedication, Kurt has received numerous awards including the 2014 Kevin Quinlan Award, the 2008 Metropolitan Police Department's Chief of Police Special Award, the MADD—Chesapeake Region Community Champion Award, and the National Highway Safety Administration's Public Service Award. Under his leadership, WRAP has also earned multiple honors including the 2019 Peter O'Rourke Special Achievement Award from the Governors Highway Safety Association and the Virginia Governor's Transportation Safety Award.

While Kurt has been publicly lauded by local, state, and national organizations and received many awards, I believe that his most precious possession is the knowledge of the countless people who have been kept safe and the tragedies that have been prevented through his efforts. Since its inception in 1991, nearly 79,000 safe rides home have been provided by SoberRide, the vast majority occurring during Kurt's tenure. It is not possible to know how many possible injuries or deaths have been prevented, but these unknown potential victims all owe a deep debt of gratitude to Kurt and WRAP.

Madam Speaker, for two decades Kurt Erickson has played an integral role in the effort to eliminate impaired driving and underage drinking. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kurt on his 20th Anniversary with WRAP and in thanking him for his tireless advocacy and unending efforts to keep our roads and our residents safe.

RECOGNIZING JAKE AND TIFFANY SACHE OF LAKE CITY

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jake and Tiffany Sache of Levy County, Florida for their dedication to the agriculture industry.

Jake and Tiffany raise beef cattle and harvest hay and grass seed on several farms throughout Levy and Gilchrist counties. They understand the importance of land conservation and have been recognized on numerous occasions for their outstanding conservation practices on their farm land.

Their commitment to agriculture production extends beyond their farm and into the com-

munity, where this couple serves in multiple capacities. They are active in their local County Farm Bureau organization and serve as members of the Levy-Gilchrist County Young Farmers and Ranchers Committee.

During Florida Farm Bureau's annual meeting this past October, they received the highest statewide honor for agriculture producers known as the Achievement in Agriculture Award. This honor is given to those who are not only skillful in farm production, but have also successfully developed their agricultural enterprise and extensively serve their local community and Farm Bureau.

Agriculture sustains our economic growth, promotes environmental stewardship, and continuously replenishes our food resources. I encourage you to thank a farmer whenever given the opportunity. I thank Jake and Tiffany Sache for choosing a career path and lifestyle that sustains our economy and puts food on the table.

SMALL AIRPORT MOTHERS' ROOMS ACT OF 2019

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROL D. MILLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 16, 2019

Mrs. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask for support for my bill, H.R. 3362, the Small Airport Mothers' Room Act of 2019.

Travelling with infants, while rewarding, can often be stressful on new mothers. This legislation helps lessen this anxiety and allows for mothers to have a quiet, private space to care for their young ones.

As air travel continues to be one of the most preferred and popular means of transportation, we need to make sure that airport infrastructure is properly updated to fit not only the needs of American mothers but American families as well.

H.R. 3362 would require small hub airports to construct mothers' rooms, which are areas where mothers can nurse their children in privacy.

The FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 required all large and medium hub airports to construct mothers' rooms by 2021. My bill would help fill the remaining gap and similarly require small hub airports to install mothers' room, extending this coverage to 97 percent of all travelers.

Thank you to Chairman DEFAZIO, Ranking Member GRAVES and my colleagues on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for their support on my bill.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the T&I Committee staff for their assistance with this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 3362.

HONORING SARAH E. NAKATA

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my Carmel District Office

intern, Sarah E. Nakata for her work and service to the citizens of the 5th District of Indiana. Sarah has the spirit of a giver, the strength of a fighter and a heart of gold. She truly is an inspiration to all of us and I am proud to have her as a part of my team. The first time I met Sarah, I was presenting her an offer of appointment to the prestigious United States Military Academy at West Point during my second year as a Member of Congress in 2014. Her dream was to serve our nation in the United States Army and on that day, her dream became a reality.

While Sarah attended high school at Covenant Christian in Indianapolis, she thrived inside and outside of the classroom both academically and athletically. She was a part of the Rifle Team, Rocket Team, Math Club, a member of the National Honor Society, attended NASA Explorer School and participated in band and pep band. Sarah was a tutor for English, Math, Science, and Spanish, all while volunteering her time at English as a Second Language classes as well as at the National Rifle Association's National Rifle Matches. She graduated high school with a 4.3 GPA and ranked first in her graduating class. She had a love for science, space, and mathematics but her true passion was rifle shooting.

While on the Rifle Team at Covenant Christian High School, Sarah earned nine state titles, three national junior titles and served as a team captain. She was an Indiana Rifle State Champion in 2011 and 2012 through the Indiana State Rifle and Pistol Association. She joined the USA Shooting Team and was a National Junior Olympic Rifle Championship qualifier and participant in 2012 and 2013. Sarah was named the National Metric Grand Aggregate Prone and Position Intermediate Junior Champion in 2012 by the National Rifle Association and was National Metric Iron Sight Position Junior Champion in 2013. These achievements caught the attention of multiple colleges and educational institutions, including the United States Military Academy at West Point. Sarah was recruited for her skills in rifle shooting and received a Letter of Assurance from the academy. The last thing she needed in order to attend was a congressional or presidential nomination.

As she was finishing her time at Covenant Christian High School, Sarah started the application process to attend the United States Military Academy at West Point through my office. As many know, it is no easy feat to be accepted into an academy and it takes hard work, dedication and commitment, which is exactly what Sarah had. These academies have the best and brightest students and Sarah was among those ranks. In the spring of 2014, Sarah received a congressional nomination from my office and on May 1, 2014, I presented her with an offer of appointment. Sarah reported to duty as a cadet at West Point in June of 2014 to begin her Plebe year.

During the summer between Sarah's sophomore and junior year in June of 2016, she began to have abdominal pains and severe nausea while participating in summer training. Several days passed and Sarah continued to feel sick, was unable to digest food, and developed chronic dehydration. She was flown to Walter Reed National Military Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland. Sarah was diagnosed with severe gastroparesis, preventing her stomach from appropriately digesting food. A

year passed, Sarah's condition had not improved, and the United States Army medically separated her.

I learned of Sarah's condition and I knew her dreams of attending the United States Military Academy at West Point and serving in the Army had come to a close. I reached out to her in late 2017 and offered her an internship in my Carmel District Office and she joined my team in January of 2018. Despite all Sarah has been through, her spirit, smile and laughter lifts up my team each and every day she is in the office. After years of testing, hospital visits, surgeries and medications, Sarah and medical professionals still do not have a full understanding of her illness, symptoms or a pathway for treatment, recovery or for a cure.

Sarah is resilient and strong. I know her illness will not hold her back from accomplishing her new goals and striving for her dreams. Sarah has taught us all to not let the little things bother you, as you never know where life will take you. Life is precious and Sarah is a true inspiration to all of us. She will go on to do many great things after her internship ends and I thank her for her service to the residents of the 5th District of Indiana and to our country. It is with immense hope and great optimism that we look forward to watching Sarah embark on her future endeavors, with her parents Heidi and David by her side.

APPROPRIATIONS BILLS FOR FY
2020, H.R. 1865 AND H.R. 1158

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. DeFAZIO. Madam Speaker, this week the House passed two bills that will fund the federal government through Fiscal Year (FY) 2020.

The first package, which I voted in support of, includes a number of provisions which I strongly support.

First, I am proud to have worked in conjunction with Senators MERKLEY and WYDEN as well as Rep. SCHRADER to ensure that this package forgives a multi-million-dollar interest burden owed by Oregon's Pacific groundfish fisheries. This burden was created solely by bureaucratic incompetence, and the inclusion of this provision is a huge win for Oregonians.

The bill also increases funding for programs that hundreds of Oregonians depend upon, such as YouthBuild, JobCorps, and Senior Corps. I led the charge to secure an additional \$13 million above FY 2019 levels for the Senior Corps program, ensuring volunteers earn an increased stipend which will allow them to take hundreds of more dollars home a year. It also increases funding for Pell Grants—easing the way for more people to afford an education. It also included record investments for early childhood education programs, more funding for rural broadband, and a reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools program through 2020. In addition, it includes the highest funding level for the Land and Water Conservation Fund in 15 years.

The bill makes robust investments to support our nation's veterans, including funding for suicide prevention, homeless assistance programs, rural health initiatives, opioid abuse prevention, and funding for the VA's electronic

health record initiative to ensure our veterans get the care they have earned and deserve.

The package also includes \$25 million for gun violence research at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH)—the first time in more than 20 years. The bill secures record-level funding for life-saving healthcare research at the NIH and CDC, and it extends funding for vital community health centers, the National Health Service Corps, and Teaching Health Centers.

Unfortunately, I am deeply disappointed that this bill included a provision that would extend market exclusivity rights to Big Pharma for certain medicines, allowing these companies to price-gouge consumers for longer periods of time without competition from more affordable, generic drugs.

The second appropriations bill also includes a number of provisions that I strongly support, including a 3.1 percent pay raise for both our men and women in uniform and federal civilian employees, as well as robust funding for the STOP School Violence Act, legislation that would give students and teachers the tools they need to help prevent school shootings. It includes increased investment in election security, the National Guard Youth Challenge, the National Science Foundation, and the Census Bureau, so that it can effectively and accurately carry out the 2020 Decennial Census.

I also led the fight to include funding for esophageal cancer research, which I am pleased to report was incorporated into the bill as part of \$110 million for the Department of Defense's Peer-Reviewed Cancer Research Program (PRCRP). I strongly support the robust funding included for numerous other defense health and cancer research programs as well.

Unfortunately, despite including provisions I strongly support, I voted against this second bill because it also contains several objectionable provisions.

For example, this bill once again increases funding for an already-bloated Pentagon budget, including a massive increase to the Pentagon's Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) account—a fiscally irresponsible slush fund that is not counted in the budget, has no congressional oversight, and gives a blank check to fund endless wars that Congress hasn't authorized. For years, Congress has continued to increase the Pentagon's budget despite overwhelming evidence of its waste and abuse of taxpayer money. I believe this legislation could have made responsible cuts to our defense budget without jeopardizing the safety of our troops, preventing a pay increase, or undermining our national security.

I am also extremely disappointed that this final bill stripped out a repeal of the 2001 Authorization for the Use of Military Force and a provision to block funding for the U.S.'s involvement in the Saudi-led coalition's involvement in Yemen's civil war—both of which were included in the House-passed defense appropriations bill earlier this year. This is yet another example of Congress abdicating its constitutional authority to finally put a stop to the endless wars that have cost countless lives and taxpayer money.

This legislation fails to effectively check the Department of Homeland Security's border policies and spending. The bill includes funding for President Trump's wasteful and ineffec-

tive border wall, lacks appropriate restrictions to prevent the Trump administration from raiding funds from other agencies to spend on immigration detention and the wall, and does virtually nothing to provide necessary oversight against enforcement-only immigration policies.

The Trump administration's policies have resulted in cruel family separations, record levels of detained immigrants, especially children, in cruel conditions, and the death of at least two dozen immigrants while in federal custody. Instead of enacting strong, enforceable oversight mechanisms, this bill largely maintains the status quo. That is unacceptable. Congress needs to be a check against the executive branch's authority.

For these reasons, I opposed this second appropriations package. I will continue to fight against Republican efforts to hand billions of dollars in taxpayer money to a bloated and wasteful Pentagon and work to rein in the Trump administration's cruel enforcement-only immigration agenda.

RECOGNIZING THE WINNERS OF
THE PI LAMBDA LAMBDA CHAPTER
OF THE OMEGA PSI PHI
FRATERNITY, INC.'S 2019
ACHIEVEMENT WEEK AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the 15th Anniversary of the Pi Lambda Lambda Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. and to congratulate winners of this year's Pi Lambda Lambda Achievement Week Awards. The winners of this award exemplify the four founding principles of Omega Psi Phi. The contributions of these men and women have been influential to the communities of Prince William County.

The Pi Lambda Lambda Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Inc. was chartered in 2004 and supports their mission to help others in need. The chapter includes the communities of Prince William County, the City of Manassas, the City of Manassas Park, and Stafford County. Through their community activism, they sponsor a variety of initiatives to enrich their neighborhoods through educational and humanitarian activities. Each year, individuals who have made a significant impact are honored for their efforts. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following names of the 2019 Achievement Week Award recipients:

The Citizen of the Year Award: Francia Salguero

The Colonel Charles Young Military Leadership Award: Major Ahmad G. Andrews

The Founders Lifetime Achievement Award: Rev. (Dr.) Luke E. Torian

Superior Service Award: Albert Woods

Omega Man of the Year: Jeffrey W. Allen

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2019 Pi Lambda Lambda Achievement Week Award winners. These individuals all played a significant role in enriching our neighborhoods, serving as testament of the generosity of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity. I thank them and all the members of the Pi Lambda Lambda Chapter for their immense contributions to our community and wish them continued success.

HONORING THE LEGACY OF THE
USS PITTSBURGH (SSN-720)**HON. GUY RESCENTIALER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. RESCENTIALER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the legacy, veterans, and service members of the USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720), a fast-attack Los Angeles Class Submarine. Next month, the USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720) will be decommissioned in Bremerton, Washington after 35 years of service in the United States Navy.

The USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720) was laid down in April 1983 and commissioned in November 1985. In April 1991, the USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720) and USS *Louisville* (SSN-724) launched Tomahawk missiles against Iraq during Operation Desert Storm.

Years later, in 2002, the ship departed for the Mediterranean Sea and participated in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Retired Captain Mark Breor, then Commander of Submarine Squadron 2, stated of the submarine and crew, "USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720) provided persistent intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance to the joint commanders. The products of these very successful and difficult missions were converted into a full array of sea-strike options, which included a 16 Tomahawk strike by USS *Pittsburgh*."

In November 2017, USS *Pittsburgh* completed its 1,000th dive, a milestone few submarines reach in service. Earlier this year, the USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720) returned to its homeport, Naval Submarine Base New London, after its final deployment.

The USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720) is the fourth ship to bear the name of a great city that helped build America. Pittsburgh leads the nation in health care, technology innovation, and energy industries and dominates athletics with numerous professional championships. I am proud to represent southwestern Pennsylvania in Congress, and I am thankful for the service of these great sailors aboard the USS *Pittsburgh* (SSN-720).

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of two articles of impeachment—one regarding abuse of power and one regarding obstruction of Congress—against President Trump.

I decided to support the President's impeachment after a judicious consideration of the facts established by the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (HPSCI) and the House Committee on the Judiciary, as well as reflecting upon my constitutional responsibilities as a Member of Congress.

I would note that the constitutional remedy for high crimes and misdemeanors—such as

abuse of power—is impeachment. Regrettably, the President's severe misconduct with respect to Ukraine showed a complete disregard for our Constitution, our democratic system of government, and the security of our nation and our allies. The President left the House with little choice but to faithfully discharge its duty.

As the Chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I believe that it is unconscionable that an American leader would use nearly \$400 million in military aid appropriated by Congress—and signed into law by the President himself—as leverage for personal gain.

There are fundamental reasons why U.S. law provided these desperately needed funds to Ukraine. I would emphasize that, in 2014, Russia invaded Ukraine and illegally annexed the Ukrainian territory of Crimea while Russian-backed separatist forces seized control of key cities in eastern Ukraine. The fighting in eastern Ukraine continues to this day and has killed more than 13,000 Ukrainians while forcibly displacing more than two million individuals.

Additionally, the impeachment reports issued by the HPSCI and the House Committee on the Judiciary present an irrefutable case that the President's behavior constituted an ongoing threat to a free and fair Presidential election in 2020.

Further, I believe that the President's refusal to comply with the impeachment inquiry is representative of his broader contempt for Congress and its constitutional role as a separate and coequal branch of government. Congress must continue to work diligently to protect and fully exert its complete range of constitutional prerogatives and maintain the balance of power that has existed for 231 years.

Finally, I would highlight that the administration's complete repudiation of constitutionally-prescribed legislative authorities stands in stark contrast to the courage and patriotism demonstrated by the whistleblower who filed a formal complaint with the Intelligence Community's Inspector General, as well as the public servants who testified before the House. These individuals deserve our utmost respect and gratitude.

As the Senate moves forward with a trial to determine whether to convict the President of impeachable offenses, be assured that I will continue to work hard to address the pressing needs of our nation's citizens, from creating more opportunities for good-paying jobs to decreasing the cost of prescription drugs.

CONGRATULATING THE 2019
BISHOP GUILFOYLE FOOTBALL
TEAM**HON. JOHN JOYCE**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to congratulate the 2019 Bishop Guilfoyle Football Team on an outstanding season.

After a successful playoff bid, the team traveled to Hershey to compete in 2019 1 A State Championship game. Finishing the year with a 12-3 record, these student athletes should take pride in their hard-fought season.

The 2019 team includes Andrew Yanoshak, Konner Kiesewetter, Keegan Myrick, Dylan Conrad, Noah Ritchey, Dominic Yanoshak, Adam Chadbourne, Casey Smith, Deven Wyandt, Michael Lamb, Branden Wasser, Ryan Donoughe, Cooper Rother, Karson Kiesewetter, Anthony Cioffari, Vincent Cioffari, AJ Kilmartin, Ryan Negola, JT Johnston, Adrian Johnson, Collin Campbell, Sam Homan, Drew Abraham, Lucas Steinbugl, Patrick Reilly, Zach McCloskey, Dylan McNelly, Jorden McClure, Anthony Edwards, Ian Bennett, Connor Ebersole, Connor Stayer, Sante Bambocci, Cameron Maloney, Joe Meintel, Evan Himes, Colin Butler, Brendan Shaffer, Aidan Bender, Tyler Conigy, Jack Donoughe, Caleb Stevens, Brady Bithell, Reed Edwards, and Hayden Fox.

These students were coached by Justin Wheeler, Darren Elvey, Evan Imgrund, Patrick Irwin, Patrick Leamer, Joseph Thomas, and Gabe Walters.

The 2019 team joins a long legacy of Bishop Guilfoyle Football excellence. During the past six seasons, the Marauders have reached the State Championship game four times.

As a former captain of the Bishop Guilfoyle Football Team and a proud alumnus, I congratulate these students and their coaches on a successful season, and I wish them every continued success both on and off the field.

RECOGNIZING CHYANNE THOMAS
AS CONSTITUENT OF THE MONTH**HON. MIKE LEVIN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. LEVIN of California. Madam Speaker, this Holiday season, I am proud to recognize Chyanne Thomas, a postal worker from Vista, as my Constituent of the Month. Chyanne is a hero for two children, their families, and our entire community. Chyanne's vigilance while on her regular delivery route resulted in the identification of two children who had been reported missing. Her quick and caring response allowed these two local children to be safely reunited with their concerned families.

When Chyanne spotted Abby, a 15-year-old with autism, she sprang into action. She used the skills she had learned in a previous job working with children with disabilities to keep Abby calm and safe until police arrived. Two weeks later, Chyanne saw a missing 4-year-old girl alone during her route, and didn't hesitate to approach her and make sure she was okay until police and her parents arrived. Without Chyanne's awareness, compassion, and quick action, these two kids might still be missing.

While Chyanne's action to save those children is extraordinary, I also want to recognize the incredible pressure all postal workers and delivery drivers are under during the Holiday season. They endure exhausting hours, grueling weather, and much more to ensure that families have their gifts before the Holidays. Much of their work is taken for granted on a daily basis, but the Holidays would not be the same without their dedication, I am extremely grateful for their service.

I launched a Constituent of the Month to recognize individuals in the 49th District who have gone above and beyond to help their neighbors and support our community. I know

the families of those two missing children, as well as all families who are receiving Holiday packages, would agree that Chyanne is well-deserving of this recognition.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF
DANIEL F. SCIURY

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. RYAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Daniel F. Sciury, 81, who passed away on Friday, December 13, 2019.

Daniel was the face of the labor movement in Stark County, having been president of the Hall of Fame Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO, since 1984.

Mr. Sciury was born in 1938 to William and Stella Sciury. His father, William, arrived in the United States from Italy in 1910 as a teenager, and worked for 40 years as a roller grinder for Timken Roller Bearing Co. Daniel followed his father's legacy and held union leadership for more than 50 years.

Daniel was elected president of United Steelworkers Local 5260, representing workers at the now-closed Weber Dental Mfg., in 1967. He was a member of the American Federation of Musicians Local 111 and the Communication Workers of America and helped the Canton Ex-Newsboys Association charity raise money to buy needy children winter coats and clothing. In addition to fighting for the rights of workers, he also bravely served his country in Korea.

Mr. Sciury is survived by his children Daniel (Tracy) Sciury, Melissa (Scott) Baker, Krystina Sciury, four grandchildren; Frank and Vinny Sciury, Vivian and Margo Baker, sisters Isabel "Jeanne" Johnson, Rita (John) Prose, numerous nieces and nephews, and many friends.

Daniel was a strong voice in advocating for the rights of working people and I was very proud to have stood by his side. Daniel's leadership was respected by both Republicans and Democrats and his reputation went well beyond Stark County. Daniel's voice will certainly be missed. My deepest condolences go out to all whose lives were touched by Daniel.

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH SEASON OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

HON. BOB GIBBS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my fellow Representatives TROY BALDERSON (OH-12), CHERI BUSTOS (IL-17), DANNY DAVIS (IL-07), RODNEY DAVIS (IL-13), ANTHONY GONZALEZ (OH-16), BRIAN HIGGINS (NY-26), DAVID P. JOYCE (OH-14), MARCY KAPTUR (OH-09), ROBIN KELLY (IL-02), JOSEPH MORELLE (NY-25), GREG PENCE (IN-06), MIKE QUIGLEY (IL-05), BOBBY RUSH (IL-01), TIM RYAN (OH-13), STEVE STIVERS (OH-15), and MICHAEL R. TURNER (OH-10) to commemorate the 100th season of the National Football League. Our Congressional Districts include the 13 "Original Towns" from which

came the 14 charter teams that formed the American Professional Football Association, which would become the NFL.

During its inaugural 1920 season, the founding teams that competed in the new league included: the Akron Pros; Buffalo All-Americans; Canton Bulldogs; Decatur Staleys; Racine Cardinals; Chicago Tigers; Cleveland Tigers; Columbus Panhandles; Dayton Triangles; Hammond Pros; the Heralds (Detroit); Muncie Flyers; Rock Island Independents; and the Jeffersons (Rochester, N.Y.). Two years later, the new league was renamed the National Football League.

From its humble beginnings, the National Football League is now a preeminent sports league, comprised of 32 teams from 22 states across the country. In the span of a century, the league has become intricately woven into the fabric of American life and the foremost steward of what is now known as "America's Game." The league's annual "Super Bowl" Championship is the single most-watched annual television event in the United States, bringing together individuals of all ages, races, and backgrounds through a common enthusiasm for and appreciation of the game of football.

The two pillars of the NFL are football and community, which are demonstrated through the volunteerism and philanthropic efforts of players, owners, coaches and staff, including through programs and initiatives ranging from honoring our nation's veterans and servicemembers to promoting cancer awareness to encouraging youth to maintain active and healthy lifestyles. These efforts, both on and off the field, reflect the character, commitment, fortitude and teamwork that make our communities resilient and strong.

We, therefore, recognize the National Football League as a great sports league of the United States and congratulate the NFL for 100 seasons of uniting communities across the country, and look forward to another century of NFL football.

RECOGNIZING MR. WILLIAM E.
BOGAN

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. William E. Bogan, who recently passed away at the young age of 74.

Mr. Bogan, known as Earle to friends, was born in Memphis, Tennessee in 1944 before moving to Higginson, Arkansas in 1993.

He quickly joined the Higginson Fire Department and served for nearly 20 years until his retirement in 2011.

Bogan served as Higginson Fire Chief and a City Council Member for numerous years.

Higginson's Community Building is being renamed the William E. Bogan Community Center by the Higginson City Council in honor of Mr. Bogan's service and leadership in the community.

His contributions to his community will not be forgotten. I extend my respect, affection and prayers to his wife Catherine, family, and friends.

HONORING MALCOLM W.
APPLEGATE

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Malcolm W. Applegate, a titan of journalism in our nation. From the outset of his career on the sports beat at the Salina Journal in Salina, Kansas, to the end of his career as the President and General Manager of Indianapolis Newspapers Inc., and Publisher of the Indianapolis Star, Malcolm was considered by his peers to be the consummate "old school" journalist. Ever the prolific writer, Malcolm dedicated himself to delivering honest, informative and timely news to his readers at each stop along his storied career.

Malcolm was born on January 26, 1936 in Kansas City, Missouri, to parents Florence and Paul Applegate. Growing up in Wakeeney, Kansas, Malcolm attended Trego Community High School, spending many hours after school on the basketball and tennis courts, forging lifelong friendships, and sparking a love of sports. After the tragic death of his father Paul in 1954, Malcolm and his mother Florence relocated to Topeka, Kansas, to start life anew. Wanting to stay close to home Malcolm initially chose to attend Washburn University, to study journalism and compete as a member of both the basketball and tennis teams. Later transferring to Kansas University, Malcolm continued his study of journalism while serving as the Editor of the Daily Kansan. It was also during this time that Malcolm competed as a member of the Kansas men's varsity tennis team and joined the Sigma Phi Epsilon Fraternity.

Near the end of his time at Kansas University, Malcolm would reconnect with grade school friend Constance Eaton, a student at nearby Fort Hays State University. Their friendship would quickly blossom into a lifelong love affair. After they both graduated from their respective universities, they began their life together, getting married on July 12, 1959.

After earning a Master's Degree from the University of Iowa in 1961, Malcolm joined the faculty at Fort Hays State University. He later returned to Kansas University, this time as the Assistant Dean of the Journalism School. In 1969, Malcolm was offered the chance to join the well-respected Gannett Newspaper Company. He relocated to Rochester, New York with Connie, and their daughters, my very dear friends Kellie and Paula. Malcolm then began to rise up the ranks of Gannett which led to a number of opportunities.

In 1971, Malcolm became the Editor of the Ithaca Journal in Ithaca, New York. Later in 1975, he relocated to Lafayette, Indiana to become the Publisher of the Lafayette Journal & Courier, and the Regional Vice President of USA Today. Malcolm's next opportunity came with a move to Lansing, Michigan in 1986, where he would serve as both the Publisher of the Lansing State Journal and Vice President of USA Today.

In 1990, Malcolm and his family arrived at their final stop in Indianapolis, Indiana, where Malcolm served as the President and General Manager of Indianapolis Newspapers Inc., and as Publisher of the Indianapolis Star until his

retirement in 1998. Under his stewardship, he prepared the Indianapolis Star for the new digital era of news journalism, maintaining the paper's status as a beacon of journalistic integrity during this time of extreme transformation throughout the industry. Serving in these many leadership roles throughout the decades helped to mold Malcolm into one of the premier newspapermen in the United States. At every stop along his career, Malcolm was known for being both a mentor to young journalists, and a bonafide newsman, able to show the same dedication to the local news beat, that he showed when interviewing prominent national figures such as fellow Kansan Senator Bob Dole and others.

Upon his retirement, Malcolm maintained a role in the Indianapolis community as a dedicated philanthropist. His work with organizations such as Goodwill Industries, Big Brothers Big Sisters, and the United Way of Central Indiana helped to improve the lives of many fellow citizens. Malcolm was also very involved with the Indianapolis 500 Festival, a volunteer organization that conducts civic events celebrating the Indianapolis 500. As a loyal Kansas Jayhawk alumni, Malcolm donated \$500,000 to create the Malcolm W. Applegate Distinguished Professorship in Editing Fund at Kansas University's School of Journalism in 2002.

Always the avid sportsman, Malcolm was often seen on the tennis courts of the community. As a lover of all sports, Malcolm took distinct pleasure in sharing his love of sports with his children and grandchildren, raising an impressive family of athletes. Known by his family as "the World's Biggest Kansas Jayhawk Fan", his daily wardrobe choices often included the school colors Crimson & Blue. Also an avid fan of both the Indianapolis Colts and Indiana Pacers, friends would often see him and his family in their season ticket seats ready to cheer the home team to a victory.

After many decades of service to both his readers and his fellow citizens, Malcolm passed away on October 20, 2019. Malcolm will be forever missed by his family, friends, colleagues, and the entire national journalism community. On behalf of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I extend my deepest condolences to Malcolm's wife Connie, their daughter Kellie Prusiecki, her husband Drew, grandchildren Katie and Adam, as well as their daughter Paula Quammen, her husband Ron, grandchildren Christopher and Matthew, and all who mourn his passing.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANDY
ANDERSON OF MEXICO BEACH

HON. NEAL P. DUNN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Andy Anderson who was called home to his Lord and Savior last month. Andy is known by many throughout the State of Florida for his political endeavors and accomplishments.

Four short months ago, he and his family packed up and moved to Mexico Beach where Andy inherited the role of City Manager. I had the honor and privilege of meeting Andy while he served in this position. He took his respon-

sibilities seriously by taking on one of the most devastated cities touched by Hurricane Michael. Andy knew the work that was cut out for him, but he was up for the challenge.

Mexico Beach and Bay County instantly knew that Andy belonged there, and everyone soon realized what a great person and public servant Andy was.

Prior to his service with Mexico Beach, Andy served as a City Councilman for the City of Palm Bay and as a County Commissioner for Brevard County. The entire State, along with Mexico Beach and the Anderson family, is now missing a remarkable man and our hearts go out to those lives that Andy has touched.

Andy Anderson was a truly incredible individual. Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the life of Mr. Andy Anderson.

RECOGNIZING CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY
PATROL ASSISTANT CHIEF
LAURA QUATTLEBAUM

HON. RAUL RUIZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize California Highway Patrol Assistant Chief Laura Quattlebaum for her years of service with the California Highway Patrol.

Every day, our first responders and public safety officers put their lives on the line to keep us safe. In our local communities, a shining example of that very selflessness and courage is California Highway Patrol Assistant Chief Laura Quattlebaum.

Assistant Chief Quattlebaum is an amazing woman, full of character and integrity. I am humbled to have worked alongside her in our community, and I am honored to call her my friend.

For more than 30 years, Assistant Chief Quattlebaum has served as a dedicated public officer for my constituents as well as countless other Californians. After graduating from the California Highway Patrol Academy, she went on to act as Public Information Officer for the City of Indio. From this critical position to her current role as California Highway Patrol Assistant Chief, she has answered the call many times to defend our public safety.

Throughout her career, Assistant Chief Quattlebaum has been recognized on numerous occasions for her outstanding work. As Lieutenant in the Indio Area, she received the Commissioner's Commendation for her leadership in Cultural Awareness and Racial Profiling training. Six years later, Assemblyman Brian Nestande awarded Assistant Chief Quattlebaum the 2013 Women of Distinction Award. Again in 2014, Assemblyman Manuel Perez presented her with the Woman of Year award in recognition of her service to the people of California.

Chief Quattlebaum is known to her colleagues as a hardworking and selfless leader. Her tireless commitment to bettering the lives of others is reflected in her incredible advocacy for those she serves alongside and for peace officers throughout the country. I have witnessed this dedication firsthand on multiple occasions, most notably, when we worked together to successfully double our nation's funding for mental health services for our local law enforcement agencies.

Assistant Chief Quattlebaum's career in public service is a true testament to her devotion to community, country, and public safety. Her unwavering dedication to the people of California is admirable.

After she retires from her position as California Highway Patrol Assistant Chief this year, I have no doubt that she will continue to positively impact our community as she mentors and prepares students at College of the Desert for a future in law enforcement.

I want to thank Assistant Chief Quattlebaum for her years of service and for all that she has done to keep our communities safe. On behalf of California's 36th Congressional District, I wish her a long, happy retirement.

RECOGNIZING MAJOR DANIEL
NASKE

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Major Daniel Naske of the U.S. Air Force, upon his graduation from the U.S. Air Force Legislative Fellowship program. Assigned to my office for the 2019 calendar year, Major Naske quickly became an integral part of my team, lending his expertise and experience as a senior pilot and U.S. Air Force Weapons Officer to guide and inform my work as Chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee within the House Armed Services Committee. Over this past year, Major Naske has worked closely with my personal staff and Readiness Subcommittee staff on the military's most pressing readiness challenges. He will be deeply missed after an exceptional year of service.

Major Naske is a native of upstate New York and is a Distinguished Graduate from Clarkson University ROTC with a degree in Electrical Engineering. He also holds a Master of Arts in Military History from American Military University.

Major Naske began his flying career in 2009 and was first assigned as a pilot of the MC-12W reconnaissance aircraft. In 2011, Major Naske became qualified on the C-17A Globemaster III and became an Instructor Pilot in 2013. Additionally, he is a graduate of the esteemed U.S. Air Force Weapons School. Major Naske's exemplary U.S. Air Force career spans more than 2,400 hours in airlift and reconnaissance aircraft, and of that, 1,002 are in combat.

Major Naske and his wife, Caitlin, have two beautiful daughters, and his family continues to support him and his service to our nation.

This moment is bittersweet, as we are deeply saddened to lose such an essential member of our team. However, we are excited for what his career and future hold, knowing that he will be a force for good and continue to impact the lives of those around him, just as he did here.

Dan, know that you will always have a family here and we hope that one day your path leads you back to the Halls of Congress.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the U.S. Congress and a grateful Nation, I extend our deepest appreciation to Major Daniel Naske for his dedicated service to the U.S. Air Force, U.S. House of Representatives, and to our Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HAWAII INVASIVE SPECIES PROTECTION ACT

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague, Representative GABBARD, in introducing our bill to protect one of the most unique and fragile environments on Earth, our Hawai'i, from devastating invasive species.

Invasive species pose an especially grave threat to Hawai'i's unique ecosystems, natural resources and agricultural communities, in part due to Hawai'i's unique geography. Hawai'i is the most isolated island chain and one of the most ecologically diverse places in the world. We are 2,282 miles from the Continental United States, 2,952 miles from Japan and 4,772 miles from Washington, D.C., with no other islands in close proximity. We have within our constrained borders ten of the thirteen world climate zones, with ecosystems ranging from desert to tropical, where plants and animals that found their way to Hawai'i evolved like nowhere else. A 2014 survey identified fully 9,975 endemic species in Hawai'i. These species include the Hawaiian scarlet honeycreeper, the 'i'iwi; the flowering evergreen; and the state bird of Hawai'i, the nēnē.

However, tragically, in large part due to invasive species, Hawai'i has become the endangered species and extinction capital of the world. Hawai'i currently has 503 species listed as endangered, more than any other state and almost half of the total endangered species nationwide. Many of these species are critically endangered and face an extremely high risk of extinction in the wild. Although we will never know the true number of species that have gone extinct in Hawai'i, best estimates are that in the last 200 years alone, 28 bird, 72 snail, 74 insect and 97 plant species have gone extinct.

As one particularly poignant example, earlier this year the Atlantic published an article, *The Last of Its Kind*, which chronicled the death of George the snail. He was the last *achatinella apexfulva*, a species of tree snail that is endemic to the island of O'ahu. This article calls attention to the alarming fact that snails in Hawai'i are disappearing at an alarming rate, perhaps faster any animal on Earth right now, victims of various factors in part linked to invasive species.

The threat to our state tree, the 'ōhi'a lehua, is also illustrative of our growing crisis. Used for poi boards and outrigger canoes, the 'ōhi'a lehua is important to Hawaiian culture and the islands' watersheds. As the first tree to grow in new Hawai'i lava flows, 'ōhi'a grows throughout the watershed creating new soil, stabilizing steep mountain ridges and comprises approximately 80 percent of Hawai'i's native forests. However, rapid 'ōhi'a death, or ROD, caused by an invasive fungal pathogen, kills 'ōhi'a trees quickly, and threatens the stability of Hawai'i's native forests. Since its discovery on the Big Island in 2014, ROD has spread to Kaua'i, Maui and O'ahu, and has killed hundreds of thousands of trees.

Hawai'i's unique circumstances also have given rise to one of our nation's most diverse and productive agricultural communities. With a year-round growing cycle, our crops have

ranged throughout our history from the highest quality sugar and pineapple and cattle to tropical specialty crops like fruit and cut flowers in the highest demand worldwide.

Yet it is exactly because these crops like our natural resources have adapted to Hawai'i's uniqueness that they are the most susceptible to devastation from external species against which they have no natural defenses. Invasive species have drastically impacted agriculture in Hawai'i, threatening some of the island's most valuable crops in the state's third-largest industry.

The coffee berry borer, which was discovered in Kona in 2010, now infects all of the coffee growing islands in Hawai'i, except Kaua'i. The coffee berry borer can cause yield losses of between 30 and 35 percent and affects the quality of the coffee beans, directly impacting the income of growers. Our failure to prevent coffee leaf rust from entering Hawai'i could leave one of Hawai'i's most iconic industries devastated.

Hawai'i's third most valuable crop, the macadamia nut, is under threat from the macadamia felted coccid. Macadamia felted coccid has been found in all of Hawai'i Island's macadamia growing regions. The felted coccid reduces macadamia tree output by draining nutrients from the tree. Invasive species coupled with increased rain led to a 22 percent decline in the macadamia nut harvest this year compared to last year.

Yet despite these incontrovertible and growing impacts of external species on Hawai'i's natural resources and economy, existing federal law leaves Hawai'i largely defenseless against increasingly destructive invasives. Imports by air and sea, the only means of inbound transportation to our island state, lack any effective regulation to screen out invasives. This is despite a fairly robust screening of exports from Hawai'i to the Continental United States to screen out invasives from Hawai'i viewed as harmful to mainland agriculture (invasives that, ironically, were invasives into Hawai'i to start with).

I sought to crack down on this lax regime to prevent and curb invasives with my introduction in 2005 of H.R. 3468, modeled after New Zealand and other isolated jurisdictions with then like now the most stringent invasive species prevention regimes in the world. Since the introduction of that bill, the threats from invasives have only grown. Since 2005, 195 invasive species have been introduced to Hawai'i. That is in addition to the roughly 5,000 invasive species that have been introduced to Hawai'i throughout its history.

Our bill, the Hawai'i Invasive Species Protection Act, will require the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Animal and Plant Inspection Service (APHIS), in cooperation with other federal departments and the State of Hawai'i, to conduct visual, x-ray and canine inspections, as appropriate, on person, baggage, cargo and any other article destined for direct movement to the State of Hawai'i. The inspections will search for high-risk invasive species and agricultural materials. The inspections will be conducted at airports, ports and postal sorting facilities prior to direct travel to the State of Hawai'i.

Our bill further requires APHIS to work with the State of Hawai'i to develop and publish a list of the high-risk invasive species and agricultural materials for the State of Hawai'i. It pays for these inspections by increasing Agri-

culture Quarantine Inspection fees to cover the full cost of inspection.

If we truly care about the threat that continued and escalating invasive species pose to one of the most invaluable and unique ecosystems on earth, in addition to our unique economy and way of life, then the stark reality is that this bill is what it will take. Again, it is not revolutionary when compared to other countries that have not only recognized this threat but actually done something about it. And it is certainly not revolutionary when compared to longstanding domestic restrictions on exports from Hawai'i, leading to the basic point that if these invasive species prevention requirements are good enough for the rest of the country and much of the world then they're good enough for Hawai'i.

Madam Speaker, I am grateful to this House for your understanding and careful consideration of Hawai'i's challenge and opportunity, and ask for our bill's expeditious passage. Thank you (Mahalo).

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, I am the only member of Congress who has voted to open impeachment inquiries against Presidents William J. Clinton and Donald J. Trump, a Democrat and a Republican.

Since then, I have voted to hold attorneys general of both parties in contempt for obstructing legitimate congressional inquiries.

One of the most important roles for Congress to perform is acting as a coequal branch of government, holding the executive branch accountable to the rule of law and the Constitution.

No one comes to Congress to impeach a president. I have always said it should be a last resort. I know impeachment is inherently divisive and brutal. The first casualty is usually the facts. I took an oath of office, not to any political party or person, but to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. Congress is the only institution in our democracy that can hold a president accountable.

The House opened an inquiry after learning of a whistleblower complaint alleging that the president actively coerced Ukraine to meddle in our elections.

This complaint came from a nonpartisan intelligence officer working in the White House. By law, the report had to be turned over to Congress to be investigated.

As a formal special prosecutor, I know that it is important to follow the facts and evidence. For the past few months, the House investigated these serious allegations outlined in the whistleblower's report. Here are those facts:

During a phone call on July 25th, President Trump asked Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky to "do us a favor though," immediately after discussing frozen military aid. He urged President Zelensky to work with his personal attorney Rudy Giuliani and Attorney

General William P. Barr in opening investigations connected to a political opponent, Vice President Joseph Biden, Jr., and a debunked conspiracy theory alleging that Ukraine—not Russia—was responsible for meddling in the 2016 election.

Just weeks before the call, President Trump withheld nearly \$400 million in critical security assistance to Ukraine, which had been overwhelmingly approved by Congress. No reason was given for the hold beyond that it was directed by the president. The hold on security assistance was lifted only after the whistleblower complaint was filed and Congress opened its inquiry.

The investigation also revealed that besides withholding military aid, the president and his allies withheld White House meetings, phone calls and trade preferences from Ukraine.

We heard from nonpartisan State Department and intelligence officials who worked for the president, and they confirmed the allegations outlined in the whistleblower reporter.

I have reviewed the evidence and followed the hearings. It is clear the president's actions were a flagrant abuse of constitutional power; it was unlawful, and it jeopardized our national security.

The president had every opportunity to present contrary evidence but did not. Instead, he chose to obstruct the inquiry, preventing top officials from testifying and withholding relevant information.

Some have argued to let the voters in the next election decide. But how can we trust an election that the president is trying to corrupt?

I grew up in this country believing no one is above the law, including the president. If any president—Democrat or Republican—had committed these offenses, I would reach the same conclusion. And I ask others how they would feel if President Obama, instead of President Trump, engaged in this conduct.

Not all bad conduct is impeachable. Being rude or mean is not impeachable. Jaywalking, petty theft or infidelity does not put our national security at risk. But asking another country to meddle in our election and withholding vital security assistance to an ally is what our founders feared and why they placed impeachment in our Constitution.

The president once said that he could stand in the middle of Fifth Avenue and shoot somebody without losing any support. Clearly, he was exaggerating, but have we become so partisan, polarized, and tribal that as long as it is someone on our "team," they can defy the law?

The president is wrong to believe this is all about him. More importantly, it is about defending the rule of law and our Constitution and what signal we send future presidents of what is acceptable behavior. In short, do we want a democracy where no one is above the law, or do we want a monarchy?

The decision of whether the president should be removed from office now rests with the Senate. In the meantime, I will continue to work across party lines, tackling issues of importance like lowering health care and prescription drug costs, ending trade wars, and combating the student loan debt crisis.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, other than authorizing an act of war, impeachment is the gravest item that we as a Congress can consider. The decision to move forward with impeachment of a United States President is so consequential that it has only been done three times in our entire nation's history prior to this year, all based on legitimate evidence of criminal behavior. Unfortunately, many of my colleagues have diminished what should be a solemn and grave proceeding into an absolute political circus, simply because they don't like the man occupying the White House.

Many Democrats have been intent on impeaching this President since the day he took office. Their actions are clearly motivated by pure hatred for President Trump. This impeachment vote today is simply the next step in their long-held plan to remove him from office.

The partisan impeachment investigation run by the House Intelligence Committee was unnecessarily held behind closed doors, in a room designed to share classified information. Nothing classified was shared during these meetings, but the result of this decision was that most Members of Congress and all Americans were blocked from hearing the facts for themselves.

It's also critical to remember that the House Intelligence Committee had no business conducting the impeachment inquiry to begin with—the House Judiciary Committee is the Committee tasked with all responsibilities surrounding impeachment in the House of Representatives. The Intelligence Committee had no business running this investigation at all, let alone running it in secret. As with past impeachment investigations, the investigation should have been led by a special prosecutor or independent counsel who then would turn over their findings to the Judiciary Committee—none of this happened here.

Chairman SCHIFF repeatedly withheld crucial information from Republicans, including the ability for anyone but himself and his staff to speak with the whistleblower at the center of this investigation. He was even called out by liberal media outlets for spreading misinformation and falsehoods throughout the impeachment process.

The public hearings were held with complete disregard for the House Rules and decades of precedent. Republicans were not allowed to call witnesses or make basic parliamentary motions. In fact, the only witnesses allowed to testify publicly were those who fit neatly within the Democrats' predetermined narrative.

Most importantly, we have not been presented with any real evidence that proves the President is guilty of "high crimes and misdemeanors," as required by the Constitution to remove a duly-elected president. If there were criminal activity, as many Democrats have claimed, then why are there no crimes listed in the articles of impeachment?

As a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I have had a ringside seat for not only the impeachment proceedings, but for the years of investigations into President Trump that preceded this one. When I led the Intelligence Committee's Russia Investigation, the Democrat minority led by Rep. SCHIFF was given every opportunity to participate, and they did so. They were not treated as a minority party, where their objections and right to call witnesses were denied as the Democrats did to Republicans in this impeachment investigation. I treated them with fairness and dignity and did not cast aspersions on them by calling their loyalty to our country or motivations into question. The investigation into Russia meddling was thorough and took more than fifteen months, during which we interviewed over 70 witnesses and poured over more than 300,000 documents. This impeachment investigation, by contrast, was rushed through in less than two months, with just a handful of witnesses.

The charade of a fair proceeding was further emphasized with the Democrats' refusal to let the defendant offer evidence and produce witnesses. The defendant—President Trump—has a right to defend himself, a right which was only ceremoniously and speciously offered once the investigation and report were completed.

It is clear—the verdict in the House was predetermined.

This has been a colossal waste of taxpayer dollars and of Congress' time. However, my greatest fear is that it's not over. When Democrats found no evidence of collusion during the Russia Investigation, they pivoted to the Mueller investigation. When Special Counsel Mueller's report did not include anything Democrat's found useful, they refocused their efforts once again to hone in on a supposed scandal with Ukraine. When this inevitably fails too, what will be the next casualty in their desperate attempt to destroy a president they dislike?

We have forever weakened this body by turning impeachment into a political weapon and set a terrible precedent for all future Congresses. This impeachment scheme is nothing more than an attempt to overturn the 2016 election and to conduct taxpayer-funded opposition research and damage the President's electability heading into 2020.

The American people see right through this charade, and are fed up. It's time to stop this madness and get back to the important work the American people sent us here to do.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Madam Speaker, the United States House of Representatives will vote to impeach the President.

This is one of the biggest decisions I have had to make in my seven years in Congress. Since I came to Congress, my goal has always been to help the lives of the people of the San Fernando Valley.

And in the past year, we have done just that.

We've passed legislation to lower the cost of prescription drugs, combat climate change, secure our elections, make sure our veterans have the care that they need, and that our children attend safe schools.

Impeachment was not our only goal.

This president left us no other choice.

After reading the facts, listening to the testimony of witnesses, and seeing how this President put his own personal political interests above the American people, I will vote to impeach Donald Trump.

This is not something I take pleasure in.

This is a solemn moment for our country.

This vote is about the safety of the American people and the future of our democracy. I cannot, in good conscience, ignore his outright disregard for the rule of law, his continued obstruction of Congress, and the use of his office for personal gain. President Trump's most recent abuse of power was the breaking point.

For a sitting president of the United States to actively seek the interference of a foreign government in our election by withholding critical military aid is a violation of his oath of office.

President Trump has purposefully damaged the integrity of our elections and put American lives at risk.

The founders of this great country and the authors of the Constitution created a system of checks and balances so that no single branch of government would become too powerful and abuse that power.

They devised a mechanism for removing a president from office should a person like Donald Trump, use the office for their own personal, unscrupulous reasons.

I came to my decision after reviewing the mountain of evidence and the testimony of several high-ranking White House officials who have testified and confirmed his malfeasance.

I do not take my responsibility as Representative for California's 29th District lightly. Serving the people of my district is one of the greatest honors of my life.

It is my constitutional obligation to do what is right for my district and for all of the American people.

Madam Speaker, President Trump remains a threat to our democracy and by voting to impeach, I am fulfilling my constitutional duty and living up to the oath I swore before the American people.

HONORING SYLVIA ROSEN ON HER
100TH BIRTHDAY

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor Sylvia Rosen, a New York City original who turned 100 years old this week.

Born December 14, 1919 in Manhattan, New York, Sylvia lived with her mother, sister and three brothers. In 1928, at age nine, Sylvia moved to Brooklyn where her family settled at south 9th and Roehling.

Sylvia attended elementary school at P.S. 16 in Williamsburg. Later, she attended Seward Park high school. Having grown up with

three brothers, Sylvia was a tomboy and enjoyed playing softball with friends and checkers and marbles with brothers and sisters.

After graduating high school, Sylvia attended a trade school for sewing. In 1939, Sylvia married her husband, Hyman, in a local synagogue. They moved to Independence Towers when they first opened in 1965. Although her husband passed away in 1978, Sylvia still resides in Independence Towers to this day.

Sylvia's best friends are Dina and Elsie. They live nearby and the three celebrate their birthdays together. She also has a cousin named Sylvia. They were both named after their grandma and her mother's best friend.

Madam Speaker, as Ms. Sylvia turns 100, I ask all my colleagues to join me in wishing her all the best for a joyous and momentous celebration.

RECOGNIZING MS. LISA
WILLENBERG

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Lisa Willenberg for being selected as the new Chancellor of the University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton (UACCM).

The college was established in 1963 and Ms. Willenberg serves as the college's fourth Chancellor and the first woman in this position.

She earned her Bachelor of Business Administration from the University of Central Arkansas and Master of Education at the University of Arkansas.

Ms. Willenberg has served at Morrilton for 27 years, first as a general accountant and, in 2011, becoming Vice Chancellor for Finance and Operations—handling the college's finances, human resources, information technology and physical plant.

Under her leadership, the college has increased its fiscal reserves, improved the college's financial scoring and constructed new campus facilities to benefit the students.

Congratulations to Chancellor Lisa Willenberg on being selected for this prestigious position, and I look forward to the school's success for years to come.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. DWIGHT EVANS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. EVANS. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about why I am voting "Yes" on both articles of impeachment against President Trump:

Impeachment is a solemn and historic task. With the outrageous, ongoing conduct of President Trump, impeachment is necessary for upholding our oath of office and the Constitution. Benjamin Franklin said after the Con-

stitutional Convention in Philadelphia that we have 'a republic, if you can keep it.' House Democrats intend to keep it.

This impeachment process, holding the President accountable, is only possible because the House majority changed, but the root cause of it all is the President's own unconstitutional, reckless behavior. He withheld \$391 million in congressionally approved, tax-funded military aid from a free country, Ukraine, that is trying to defend itself from a dictatorship, Russia, and he did this for political gain. His action appears to have cost Ukrainian lives. He obstructed investigation and oversight by Congress, which is a co-equal, independent branch of government under the Constitution. He appears to have no shame or regret about any of this behavior, which means he is likely to repeat it unless he is held accountable.

No one is above the law in America—that is the principle the House is voting to uphold. Now the nation will be watching the Senate to see if Senators will uphold their oath to do impartial justice.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. KEATING. Madam Speaker, the United States is based on a principle that our second President, John Adams of Massachusetts, so eloquently summed up long ago: we are a 'government of laws, not of men.'

No one, absolutely no one, stands above the law.

Over a century after President Adams uttered those words, another Massachusetts statesman, John F. Kennedy, delivered his famous "City on a Hill" speech before the General Court of Massachusetts prior to the start of his administration in 1961. President Kennedy powerfully proclaimed that 'we must always consider that we shall be a city upon a hill [and that] the eyes of all people are upon us.'

He continued, explaining that:

For of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each one of us—recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities to the state—our success or failure, in whatever office we may hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions:

First, were we truly men of courage—with the courage to stand up to one's enemies—and the courage to stand up, when necessary, to one's associates—the courage to resist public pressure, as well as private greed?

Secondly, were we truly men of judgment—with perceptive judgment of the future as well as the past—of our own mistakes as well as the mistakes of others—with enough wisdom to know that we did not know, and enough candor to admit it?

Third, were we truly men of integrity—men who never ran out on either the principles in which they believed or the people who believed in them—men who believed in us—men whom neither financial gain nor political ambition could ever divert from the fulfillment of our sacred trust?

Finally, were we truly men of dedication—with an honor mortgaged to no single individual or group, and compromised by no private obligation or aim, but devoted solely to serving the public good and the national interest.

Courage—judgment—integrity—dedication—these are the historic qualities of the Bay Colony and the Bay State—the qualities which this state has consistently sent to this chamber on Beacon Hill here in Boston and to Capitol Hill back in Washington.

Madam Speaker, we are called to serve in this great country with courage, judgement, integrity, and dedication. And when those among us—those in the highest positions of public trust—willingly corrupt those values for personal benefit, it is incumbent upon us to act, however reluctantly.

I believe that it has become undeniably clear that the President of the United States, Donald J. Trump, has engaged in a pattern of behavior designed to extract personal and political benefit from the Office of the President. In doing so, President Trump irreparably violated his oath to preserve—to protect—and to defend—the Constitution of the United States of America. It is with a heavy heart, and a deep reverence to that same oath that I refuse to abandon mine.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRAMENTO STATE'S EDUCATION OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the Education Opportunity Program

(EOP) at Sacramento State. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the service that Sacramento State's Education Opportunity Program provides to our community.

Sacramento State's EOP has graduated thousands of students, supporting the success of first-generation and low-income scholars from educationally-disadvantaged and historically-underrepresented communities. Sacramento State was one of the original California State University (CSU) campuses to embrace an Education Opportunity Program. Under the leadership of Dr. Edwin Klingelhofer, the program began with a successful pilot for 36 students and has expanded to now serve over 1,500 students each year. Soon after the program began at Sacramento State, the California Legislature passed Senate Bill 1072, which established similar programs at all CSU campuses. Since then, Sacramento State's EOP has thrived under the leadership of Dr. Marcellene Watson-Derbigny and the exceptional staff of the Student Academic Success and Educational Equity Programs office. Their dedicated service has paved the way for equity at Sacramento State and does not go unrecognized.

EOP was Sacramento State's first equity program. It provides admissions assistance, a special orientation to university life, the Summer Bridge Academy, academic advising, personal counseling, tutoring, financial assistance, and various other programs. EOP is vital in ensuring the access, retention, and

graduation achievements of underserved student populations. EOP is a major pathway for first-generation and low-income college students to succeed through its provision of a quality educational experience at Sacramento State. I wish the university's faculty, staff, students, and alumni success as they work to help individuals earn a college degree and fulfill their college dreams.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 50th Anniversary of the Education Opportunity Program at Sacramento State. As Sacramento State and the wider community celebrate, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the accomplishments of Sacramento State's Education Opportunity Program's staff and students, as they have paved the way for the success and representation of historically-underserved students.

INTRODUCTION OF JONES ACT MODERNIZATION BILLS

HON. ED CASE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CASE. Madam Speaker, today I introduce three bills to end a century of monopolistic closed market domestic cargo shipping to and from my isolated home state of Hawaii as well as the other island and separated jurisdictions of our country not part of the continental United States. In doing so, we will break the stranglehold on the peoples and economies of these exposed communities and their resulting sky-high costs of living which results from just a few domestic shipping companies controlling the lifeline of commerce upon which we absolutely depend.

These bills all amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, also known as the Jones Act. That federal law mandates that all cargo shipping between U.S. ports occur exclusively on U.S., not foreign, flagged vessels. Additionally, the law requires that these vessels are built in the U.S. and owned and crewed by U.S. citizens.

The Jones Act was enacted in a protectionist era under the guise of preserving a strong national merchant marine. But today it is just an anachronism: most of the world's shipping is by way of an international merchant marine functioning in an open, competitive market. And those few U.S. flag cargo lines that remain have maneuvered the Jones Act to develop virtual monopolies over domestic cargo shipping to, from and within our most isolated and exposed locales—our island and offshore states and territories—that have no alternative modes of transportation such as trucking or rail.

My Hawaii is a classic example. Located almost 2,500 miles off the West Coast, we import well over 90 percent of our life necessities by ocean cargo. There are plenty of international cargo lines who could and would compete for a share of that market. Yet only two U.S. flag domestic cargo lines—Matson Navigation and Pasha Hawaii—operate a virtual duopoly over our lifeline.

While they are nominally subject to federal regulation, the fact of the matter is that cargo prices have gone in only one direction—up, fast and repeatedly, despite a surplus of international shipping—and it is indisputable that

there is no downward market pressure which would otherwise result from meaningful competition. These accelerating cargo prices are not absorbed by the shipping lines, but passed through all the way down the chain, to the transporters, wholesalers, retailers, small businesses, mom-n-pops and ultimately consumers, of all of the elementals of life, from food to medical supplies, clothes, housing and virtually all other goods. The result is a crippling drag on an already-challenged economy and the very quality of life in Hawaii.

The broadest, deepest effects of the Jones Act on Hawaii result from its impact on west-bound imports from the continental United States to Hawaii. But Hawaii is an export location as well, in key products such as agriculture and livestock. Here the Jones Act also effectively stifles meaningful competition in getting those products to their primary markets on the U.S. Mainland. Because the producers of these products and all that rely for their own livelihood on their successful export have to eat inflated shipping costs, these export industries, which any economist knows are the ultimate key to any economy's prosperity, are also crippled.

Let's take a concrete example: Hawaii's once-prosperous ranching/cattle industry, which is so key to the economic health and the very lifestyle of so much of areas like the rural Big Island, where I was born and raised. That industry depends on getting its product, young cattle, to West Coast pens and transportation hubs in a cost-efficient manner.

There are foreign cargo carriers that specialize, through custom cattle ships and overall sensitivity and adjustment to rancher time-tables and needs, in such transport, but the Jones Act outright excludes them from the Hawaii-Mainland market. As a result, Hawaii's ranchers are reduced to two crippling, cost magnifying options.

The first is to ship their cargo by foreign carriers to Canada, where they have to go through a myriad of bureaucratic, cost-magnifying gyrations to get their product eventually to their U.S. markets. The second is to beg for the goodwill of the domestic carriers, to whom this is simply a hindrance rather than a major commitment, to ship directly to the West Coast.

And it shows: most of the cattle are first shipped from Hawaii's Neighbor Islands, where the bulk of the cattle industry is located, to O'ahu, in small "cow-tainers," where they sit for days in Honolulu Harbor awaiting the return to the Mainland of one of the massive cargo ships designed and utilized for quite another purpose. The result (besides associated higher costs) is in-harbor cattle waste disposal challenges, higher in-transit cattle mortality and lower-weight cattle delivery to market. That's what happens when you try to squeeze a square peg into a round hole.

More broadly, there is much evidence about the direct impact of the Jones Act on shipping prices to noncontiguous areas. At a basic level, the everyday goods that we rely on in Hawaii cost much more than on the Mainland, a difference which largely cannot be attributed to anything other than shipping costs. Yesterday, there was a 30 percent difference in the price of a gallon of milk at Safeway grocery stores in Honolulu and Long Beach, California. My constituents pay \$6.39 for a gallon of whole milk and those in Long Beach, one of the major ports where Hawaii's good come

from, pay \$4.49. Really, shipping that gallon of milk to Hawai'i from California is 30 percent of the total cost of the product in Hawai'i?

In 2012, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York studied Puerto Rico's economy and found that "the high cost of shipping is a substantial burden on the Island's productivity." The New York Fed found that, "[i]t costs an estimated \$3,063 to ship a twenty-foot container of household and commercial goods from the East Coast of the United States to Puerto Rico; the same shipment costs \$1,504 to nearby Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) and \$1,687 to Kingston (Jamaica)—destinations that are not subject to Jones Act restrictions." There is only one reason why costs are double to ship from the continental United States to a domestic port in Puerto Rico as compared to foreign ports in the Dominican Republic and Jamaica: there is international competition on the latter routes, none on the domestic route and the shipping companies take full advantage of that lack of competition.

The three bills I introduce today say: enough is enough. If you, the continental U.S., wants to continue the Jones Act as to shipping between your locations, that's your business. But don't penalize us island and other non-contiguous locations by throwing us to the monopoly wolves you've created.

The first bill, the Noncontiguous Shipping Relief Act, exempts all noncontiguous U.S. locations, including Hawai'i, from the Jones Act. The second, the Noncontiguous Shipping Reasonable Rate Act, benchmarks the definition of a "reasonable rate" that Jones Act shipping can charge to within ten percent of analogous international shipping rates. And the third, the Noncontiguous Shipping Competition Act, prevents monopolies or duopolies in noncontiguous Jones Act shipping. Essentially, the bills are intended to lay out options for providing relief for our U.S. noncontiguous areas. We can resolve the issue in many ways, but we must change the status quo which has had such a deep, broad and negative impact on my state and the other jurisdictions beholden to the Jones Act.

The Noncontiguous Shipping Relief Act would allow the noncontiguous jurisdictions to be serviced by non-Jones Act vessels and increase, or in some cases create any, competition in these critical shipping lanes. Again, this is a small portion of the total national Jones Act shipping where it is particularly destructive in application.

Let me address directly the argument offered up by the domestic shippers in defense of the Jones Act: that it contains important labor and environmental protections that would be lost upon repeal. My bill would retain these important protections. Specifically, it provides that all foreign shippers operating under the bill's Jones Act exemptions must comply with the same labor, environmental, tax, documentation, U.S. locus and other laws as are applicable to non-U.S. flag ships and shippers transiting U.S. waters today.

The Noncontiguous Shipping Reasonable Rate Act would define a "reasonable rate" for the noncontiguous domestic ocean trade as no more than ten percent above the rate set by a comparable international rate recognized by the Federal Maritime Commission. Currently, the Surface Transportation Board technically has the authority to adjudicate and set precedent on what a "reasonable rate" is for Jones Act shipping, but it has almost never

been used and never to a clear conclusion on what is a reasonable rate. My bill would define reasonable to remove uncertainty. Current Jones Act shipping rates vary widely and there is no central compilation of these rates. The ten percent benchmark would allow for variance but also ensure that Americans in our noncontiguous areas are not forced to pay exorbitant rates way above shipping rates which would otherwise be provided through international competition were the Jones Act not applicable.

The Noncontiguous Shipping Competition Act would exempt shipping routes to non-contiguous jurisdictions from the Jones Act requirements if a monopoly or duopoly exists on those routes. The Jones Act has resulted in the blossoming of monopolies and duopolies in our noncontiguous jurisdictions. To ensure that these communities, which are the most reliant in the country on shipping to receive necessities, are not held hostage to these dominant companies, my bill would give Jones Act exemptions to routes that are not serviced by at least three companies with separate ownership. In short, if a domestic route is in fact in a competitive environment, the Jones Act is less of a problem, but if there is no competition, then the route should be opened up to international competition by rescinding the Jones Act.

Madam Speaker, these long-overdue bills are of the utmost importance to the localities which have long borne the unfair brunt of the Jones Act. It is often difficult to pierce the veil of longstanding custom and understanding to see the real negative impacts of a law and what should instead be. It is even more difficult to change a law which provides a federally-created and endorsed monopoly under which no competition exists to hold down prices. Yet clearly the time for these measures is overdue. I urge their passage.

CELEBRATION OF NEW GARDEN ENTRANCE, GARDEN ENTRY PA- VILION, & CIRCLE

HON. WILLIAM R. TIMMONS, IV

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. TIMMONS. Madam Speaker, the Hatcher Garden and Woodland Preserve in my district recently celebrated the opening of its new garden entrance, entry pavilion, and circle. The Hatcher Garden and Woodland Preserve originated as the vision of its namesakes, Harold and Josephine Hatcher. The Hatcher's shared a passion for gardening and education. The family gradually expanded beyond their initial small wooded residential lot to ten acres, adding walking paths and trees to rehabilitate the land and reclaim eroded cotton fields. Their zeal inspired many volunteers to join their efforts to develop a gift to the community—a shared garden and woodland preserve for relaxation and information. Their life project was donated to the Spartanburg County Foundation in 1987 to ensure its continuance.

Today, the Hatcher Garden and Woodland Preserve exceeds twelve acres. It is open to the public and free of charge to all visitors, in line with the Hatcher's vision. Outdoor education programs are offered for elementary school children and opportunities are afforded

to more than 60,000 visitors to experience inspiration, enjoyment, and education through nature.

This December, a two-year project was completed at the Garden. The new facilities will enhance the experiences and opportunities enjoyed by visitors of all ages, and will continue to be a source of knowledge and information to the community. I am grateful for the Garden's continued efforts in my district and I look forward to their continued success.

RECOGNIZING THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRINCIPAL AND SECOND CHIEF OF THE ALABAMA- COUSHATTA TRIBE OF TEXAS

HON. BRIAN BABIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the inauguration of Herbert Johnson, Sr. and Donnis Battise as Principal Chief and Second Chief, respectively, of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe of Texas on January 1, 2020.

Herbert Johnson, Sr., a member of the Beaver Clan, served two terms on the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe Council, and held the position of Tribal Security Director for 21 years until his retirement in 2012. Mr. Johnson was vibrantly active in his community, serving on the Tribe's volunteer fire department and as the manager of the Tribal softball and basketball leagues for numerous years. He attended Jacksonville College, and later earned certification from Kilgore College and the Angelina Criminal Justice Center as an East Texas Police Academy reserve officer. Mr. Johnson is a member of the Indian Presbyterian Church, and has served nearly half a century on the Big Sandy Independent School District Board of Trustees. In all his endeavors, he enjoys the love and support of his wife, Deloris, and he takes great pride in their five children: Davie, Delbert, Retha, Herbert Jr., and Heather, and their five grandchildren: Jackson, Camille, Raegan, Aaliyah, and Stormi.

Donnis Battise, a member of the Bear Clan, has served two terms on the Tribal Council and has been a member of the Tribe's volunteer fire department. During the Vietnam War, Mr. Battise served in the U.S. Army and is active today with the Tribal Veterans Association. Mr. Battise was employed in the lumber and paper industries for 33 years, and more recently retired from his position as a gaming attendant at Naskila Gaming. As a fervent follower of the Indian Presbyterian Church, Donnis serves both as an ordained elder and deacon of the church. He and his wife, Carol, are the guardians of Lilly Ann Alec.

Herbert Johnson, Sr. and Donnis Battise have earned the high esteem of Tribal members through their many years of outstanding service, and it is indeed a pleasure to honor them on this special occasion.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Herbert Johnson, Sr. and Donnis Battise on their inauguration as Principal Chief and Second Chief of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe and I ask that they may be extended sincere best wishes for the future.

HONORING THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF KEYSTONE COMMUNITY SERVICES

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Keystone Community Services' 80th anniversary. For 80 years, this non-profit organization has provided critical programs and services that empower youth, families, and seniors in Saint Paul and Ramsey County, Minnesota.

Founded in 1939 as Saint Paul Community Services, a small, neighborhood community center, it provided youth programming and services to its neighbors. Programs included athletics, Color Guard, hobby clubs, and preschool-age programming. In 1941, volunteers contributed 60 hours per week to assist a total of 700 individuals. Today, more than 340 youth participate in Keystone programs that develop and sharpen their academic, social, and early employment skills, helping young people become successful adults.

In 1971, Keystone expanded to provide food shelf services to hungry neighbors. Last year, Keystone distributed 2.3 million pounds of quality, healthy food to neighbors in need. Today, more than 26,000 people each year depend on Keystone's food shelf services. Keystone's Programming for Active Seniors started in 1972, which included education, fitness classes, and social activities for low-income older adults. Today, more than 1500 older adults participate in a variety of senior programs at Keystone's two community centers in Saint Paul. Additionally, Keystone's Meals on Wheels Program provides seniors and adults with disabilities with nutritious meals and keeps them living in their homes as long as possible.

Keystone is aptly named for the essential wedge-shaped stone of an arch that locks the other pieces in place. Programs that meet basic needs, provide crisis support, build communication, and help navigate and coordinate services are the keystone of its work. Keystone Community Services has grown to serve over 30,000 people annually, in large part due to volunteers who donate 700 hours each week.

Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the 80th anniversary of Keystone Community Services strengthening Saint Paul and Ramsey County, Minnesota communities.

RECOGNIZING MAYOR JEFF TILTON FOR HIS 8 YEARS OF SERVICE AND LIFETIME OF DEDICATION OF THE ZANESVILLE COMMUNITY

HON. TROY BALDERSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. BALDERSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mayor Jeff Tilton, for his dedication to Zanesville, Ohio and the surrounding area.

Mayor Tilton's career, now spanning more than four decades, exemplifies a selfless com-

mitment to public service. After dedicating 39 years to Burnham Foundry, Jeff served three plus terms as Zanesville Councilman. Jeff was then sworn in as Mayor in 2011. Jeff's service stretches far past his duties as Mayor as he is also a member of multiple local organizations, such as the Genesis Advisory Board, the Advisory Board of the Oaks at Bethesda and Northpoint, the Zanesville Sertoma Club, and the Salvation Army Board, just to name a few.

As a holder of public office, Mayor Tilton has continually gone above and beyond his call of duty. Jeff can be credited for improving broadband access, infrastructure, and downtown development in Zanesville. Outside of local government, Jeff's dedication has manifested itself in countless ways over the years, including in his volunteer work around Zanesville. Jeff is an active volunteer with Miracle on Main Street, Souper Bowl Sunday and the Y-Bridge Arts Festival. Many different groups and organizations throughout Muskingum County have benefited from Jeff's time and assistance.

Admired and respected by the people that have had the chance to work alongside Jeff, it is evident he has left a positive impact on Zanesville and the individuals that make up the community. As family, friends, and Zanesville gather to recognize Jeff's outstanding career, I salute him for his ongoing commitment to service above self. Mayor Tilton can take great pride in all he has accomplished and in the positive impact that his work has—and will continue to—have.

I thank Jeff for his devotion to bettering Zanesville, Ohio and in turn, I honor him for his incredible record of achievement.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FRED MAYER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. HUFFMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in memory of Fred Mayer, who passed away on December 10, 2019, at the age of 86 after a lifetime of exemplary public service to his community.

Fred Mayer was born in Kansas City to Anna Landie Mayer and Maximilian Philip Mayer. His father died when he was just six months old and his mother reluctantly placed Fred and his older sister in Jewish orphanages in Kansas City and Denver while trying to secure employment to support the family. Mr. Mayer would later credit his time in the Jewish orphanages with helping to develop his great sense of justice. He would go on to champion causes that served the greater community and would always put others above himself. When he was eight, the family reunited and moved to San Francisco. At the age of 12, Mr. Mayer started working at local pharmacies and later went on to graduate from Lowell High School, the University of California, Berkeley, and in 1954, the pharmacy school at University of California San Francisco. After graduating with his pharmacy degree, Mr. Mayer served in the United States Army where he ran a mobile surgical unit in Germany.

Following his service in the Army, Mr. Mayer met and married Jacqueline Levy Mayer in

1958, and a year later, they settled in San Rafael, CA. In 1963, Mr. Mayer bought Sausalito Pharmacy and operated it for 33 years. Mr. Mayer used his pharmacy as a place to educate the community on various public health issues including the dangers of smoking and the need for safe sex education. In the 1970s, Mr. Mayer started a methadone program from within the pharmacy, and after a close friend of his died of cancer, the pharmacy became one of the first drugstores in the nation to stop the sale of tobacco. In 1974, Mr. Mayer went back to school at the University of California, Berkeley, to obtain a master's degree. Soon after, he founded a non-profit organization, Pharmacy Planning Service Inc., where he continued to deliver much needed community education on public health.

Known to all around him as larger-than-life, Mr. Mayer worked well into his later years. Most recently, he worked to educate medical cannabis users about interactions with other medications that might be harmful. He was also well known for his Great American Smokeout campaigns, bolstering National Condom Week, and his crusade to put child safety caps on prescription medications.

Mr. Mayer was a well-respected community leader who will be remembered for his dominant spirit and commitment to public service. He is survived by his daughter Heidi and his sons David and Charles. While he will be greatly missed, Mr. Mayer's legacy will live on through the indelible positive impact he had on his many friends and family and the community at large.

RECOGNIZING MR. ELWYN RAYMER FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE MUSIC INDUSTRY

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize President and CEO of the Church Music Publishers Association's (CMPA) Action Fund, Mr. Elwyn Raymer, for his 50-year career dedicated to bettering the music publishing industry.

In 1966, Raymer moved to Music City and became Music Editor for Broadman Records and Music at the Baptist Sunday School Board, currently known as Lifeway. During his time as Music Editor, he produced and published the musical Celebrate Life. This musical touched the lives of millions nationwide and sold more than 600,000 copies.

As Executive Vice President of Triune Music and Triangle Records and President of Lorenz Creative Services, Raymer focused on his advocacy for songwriters, artists, and publishers. In 1990, Raymer joined Bertelsmann Music Group (BMG) where he helped establish the group's entry and success into Contemporary Christian Music. During his tenure at BMG, he became a leader for his ability to carry out acquisitions and attract talented musicians and songwriters. While at BMG, Raymer redefined and expanded the group's scope by overseeing the purchase of Reunion Records and Music and the acquisition of half of the Sparrow Music catalogues. As a direct result, BMG went on to unleash a new era in the groups chapter of music making with songs such as

Change the World, which was performed by Eric Clapton and won the Grammy Award for "Song of the Year" in 1996.

In 2001, Raymer retired from BMG after spending over 20 years leading the group's development, but he never stopped fighting for artists, songwriters, and publishers. After retiring from BMG, Raymer became President and CEO of the Church Music Publishers Association's (CMPA) Action Fund, where he worked to protect the intellectual property rights of songwriters and publishers.

Throughout his five decades of work in the music industry, Raymer has received numerous awards for his work, including The Arnold Broida Award for Copyright Advocacy, CMPA Founders Award, the NSAI President's Award, and countless other recognitions from ASCAP, BMI, Sparrow Records, BMG, and the CMPA.

It is my honor to congratulate Raymer on his retirement and to thank him for being a tireless advocate for songwriters and publishers. I wish him and his wife, Linda, all the best as they enter this new season of life.

RETROACTIVE ADJUSTMENTS FOR FORMER MEMBER'S MEMBERS REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOW- ANCE

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, at the recommendation of the Chief Administrative Officer, I am approving retroactive adjustments for former member Peter Roskam's Members Representational Allowance in the amount of \$8,379.68 to address shortfalls in the Legislative Year 2018 due to administrative errors.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, last Friday, the 13th of December, the Judiciary Committee voted Articles of Impeachment against Donald John Trump, the 45th and current President of the United States and the House of Representatives debated and will vote on those articles of impeachment on December 18, 2019.

The Judiciary Committee considered a voluminous amount of powerful, probative, and compelling evidence demonstrating that the President violated his oath of office, disregarded the nation's security, endeavored to corrupt the 2020 presidential election, and then launched a cover-up to prevent Congress from learning the full extent of his transgressions and acting to prevent their recurrence.

Separately, I will discuss and evaluate in detail the evidence that supports the articles of impeachment, as well the evidence offered in defense of the President's conduct, but I rise

today for the limited purpose of explaining briefly the reasons why the conduct described in the resolution of impeachment is of the utmost seriousness.

On December 3, 2019, in the first of my Notes on Impeachment, I discussed and explained the enduring principles that I believe should guide consideration of any articles of impeachment.

In this, the second part of my Notes on Impeachment, I will discuss why obstruction of the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives when it is exercising the powers vested in it exclusively by the Constitution in Article 1, Section 2, clause 5, is one of the grave transgressions that can be committed in this democratic republic.

In February 2014, the military of the Russia Federation, without merit or cause, invaded the eastern part of the free and independent country of Ukraine, including the Donbass region and the Crimean Peninsula.

The United States, a strategic ally of Ukraine, reacted swiftly to the Russian invasion, condemning the military action in strong and bipartisan fashion, and providing military, humanitarian, and non-military financial assistance to the determined but beleaguered nation of Ukraine, which since 2014 has totaled approximately \$1.5 billion.

In September 2019, members of the House of Representatives were alerted to a complaint filed by a whistleblower within the Intelligence Community alleging that on a July 25, 2019, call with the President of Ukraine, the current President of the United States sought to withhold \$391 million in foreign military aid to Ukraine unless and until it announced publicly that it was currently conducting corruption investigations against the American president's perceived chief election rival.

On September 24, 2019, the Speaker of the House announced that the House of Representatives would commence an impeachment inquiry pursuant to its constitutional authority under article I, section 2, clause 5 to determine whether in connection with the July 25, 2019 telephone conversation with the President of Ukraine, the President of the United States has engaged in conduct constituting "Treason, Bribery, or other High Crimes or Misdemeanors" as specified in article II, section 4.

On September 25, 2019, the White House released a Memorandum of Conversation in which the July 25, 2019 telephone conversation between the presidents of the United States and of Ukraine was memorialized and which corroborated in all material respects the allegations of the whistle blower.

The Memorandum of Conversation released by the White House confirms that the President of the United States put his personal interests over the interests of the nation, engaged in behavior that undermines the integrity of American elections, demeans the dignity of the office of the President of the United States, and jeopardizes the security of the United States.

Rather than denying the material allegations raised or expressing any regret, contrition, or apology for the serious breach of conduct, a week later, on October 3, 2019, the President of the United States went before national television cameras and confirmed that he desired for President Zelensky's Government of Ukraine to launch the investigations he requested, stating:

"If they were honest about it, they would start a major investigation into the Bidens . . . Likewise, China should start an investigation into the Bidens, because what happened in China is just about as bad as what happened with Ukraine."

On October 22, 2019, bemoaning his fate, but not regretting his conduct, the President of the United States tweeted that "All Republicans must remember what they are witnessing here—a lynching," thus falsely drawing a moral equivalence between the exercise of the impeachment power expressly and solely conferred on the House of Representatives by the Constitution and lynching, the most heinous act of domestic terrorism and symbolic of one of the darkest and most shameful periods in America's past.

From the moment Speaker Pelosi announced the House would commence investigation of the President's conduct, the President responded by initiating and orchestrating unprecedented defiance of Congress and impeding its ability to learn the facts and impose accountability by disregarding subpoenas, refusing all requests for the production of documents, directing his political appointees and other Executive Branch employees from testifying before or cooperating with Congress, and resorting to dilatory litigation in the pursuit of pursuing frivolous and specious claims, such as Article II empowers the President can do whatever he wants or that he is absolutely immune from congressional investigation.

Madam Speaker, I am reminded that 21 years ago I served on the Judiciary Committee during the impeachment of a president, as did one of my predecessors, the late Barbara Jordan, who reminded the nation that our country depends on us to be big in the biggest moments.

This generational passing of the torch is not unique but rather an indelible feature of the American Experience passed down to us from the Framers who met in Philadelphia 232 years ago to craft a Constitution forming a more perfect union, establishing justice, ensuring domestic tranquility, providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessing of liberty to them and their posterity.

More than two centuries ago, in 1776, this country was founded on the basis of a bedrock belief in the revolutionary ideas that all men are created equal and are endowed with the inalienable right to life, liberty, and property; are entitled to live free of arbitrary rule; and most important, are endowed with the right to govern themselves.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence that "all Experience has sh[o]wn that Mankind are more disposed to suffer, while Evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by taking" immediate action against their oppressors.

But, Jefferson continued, "when a long Train of Abuses and Usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object, evinces a Design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty" to take immediate action to repel the danger.

Madam Speaker, the Framers had first-hand experience with the types of abuses and usurpations committed by political leaders who ruled them but were not accountable to them and detailed many of those wrongs in the Declaration of Independence.

The Framers understood and declared to the world that democratic governors derived

their powers from the knowing and voluntary consent of the governed as expressed in free, fair, and unfettered elections unmarred by the influence or sabotage of any foreign country or entity not a member of the political community.

The Framers understood that if elections are influenced by foreign actors, then voters are reduced from the great role of citizens to mere subjects, and government for and by the people is a sham.

The most important feature of a democracy is that it is the voters who alone can confer the legitimate consent and authorization necessary to govern upon the governors who are then duty-bound to represent the voters' interests, and only their interests.

Madam Speaker, the fundamental democratic compact between the governed and the governors is that the latter's authority and continuance in office comes exclusively from the governed and allegiance is owed exclusively to the governed.

This agreement can only be reached through free and fair elections, a breach of which threatens the vitality and viability of the social contract upon which democratic self-rule of, by, and for the people depends.

Based on their personal experiences, the Framers understood the importance of a president's allegiance being always and only to the nation.

President Lincoln called the United States the "last best hope of man on earth" and stated at Gettysburg the importance of finishing the work we are in to ensure that "government of the people, for the people, by the people does not perish from the earth."

The first of the two serious allegations before us is that President Donald John Trump concocted and masterminded a scheme to coerce President Volodymyr Zelensky of Ukraine to conspire with him to sabotage an American election by announcing an investigation into false charges against his perceived chief political rival so that he could retain his office and continue to abuse his power.

This is without doubt the most serious transgression that can be committed by a President who, as Lincoln said, has taken an oath "registered in Heaven" to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

The second charge leveled against the President in the article of impeachment is that once the Congress and people of the United States learned of his perfidious scheme, the President responded by orchestrating another campaign to obstruct the ability of the House of Representatives to learn the full depth of the betrayal of his oath and his office by refusing to provide required information or to make witnesses available.

Instead, the President reverted to his prior habit and practice of ignoring subpoenas, asserting specious privileges, intimidating witnesses, hiding evidence, suborning perjury, questioning the loyalty of dedicated career professionals, and pursuing frivolous litigation in the courts.

The alleged misconduct of President Trump is a trifecta in America history because it involves the commission of the three serious offenses against the system most feared by the Framers.

First, President Trump violated his oath of office by placing his personal and political interest above by the national interest by scheming to get Ukraine to investigate a potential election opponent.

Second, President Trump betrayed the national interest by withholding vital, congressionally appropriated security assistance to a beleaguered and besieged ally facing armed aggression from Russia, America's implacable foe.

Third, the essential purpose of the scheme concocted by President Trump was to enlist a foreign country to help him fix the 2020 presidential election in his favor, the very type of interference most feared by the Framers.

If American elections are not free, fair, and uninfluenced by foreign actors, then the democracy is extinguished and citizens are reduced to subjects ruled by an authority dependent not on the consent of the governed, but on the assistance and beneficence of unaccountable foreign actors.

Such a state of affairs inevitably leads to actions taken by the ruler that are not in the interests of the nation, like dishonoring treaty agreements, abandoning allies, impugning the independent judiciary and the free press, disregarding fundamental rights and liberties of the people, abrogating civic norms and virtues, pursuing acts of personal enrichment, and currying favor with foreign despots and authoritarians.

Although President Lincoln said in his First Inaugural Address that "while the people retain their virtue and vigilance no Administration by any extreme of wickedness or folly can very seriously injure the Government in the short space of four years," the Framers anticipated that the day may come when the actions of a Chief Magistrate would constitute a clear and present danger to the security and survival of the Republic.

So, to protect the republic, the Framers equipped the representatives chosen directly by the people with the necessary means of protecting their liberty by wisely including in the supreme law of the land, the Constitution of the United States, Article I, Section 2, Clause 5, which vests the sole power of impeachment in the House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, it is no accident or coincidence that the Framers established Congress first in the Constitution as Article I.

This is because unlike a monarchy or autocracy where the "King is Law," in a democratic republic, the "Law is King," and no man is above the law.

In addition to making the legislative branch the preeminent but co-equal branch, the Framers established the House of Representatives as the first of the two branches of the Congress.

Members of the House are directly elected by citizen voters and unlike the Senate, no person can be appointed to the House; all Members of the House must be elected.

Until the 17th Amendment was ratified in 1913, Senators were appointed by the State Legislature and even today a Senate vacancy can be filled by gubernatorial appointment.

Presidents, of course, are selected by electors chosen by voters.

This explains why the Framers understood the House would enjoy a "natural superiority" over the Senate and other branches of government.

Madam Speaker, in a democracy the People are the ultimate repository of political power and authority and the Framers created the House of Representatives to be the direct representative of the People.

This is why the most powerful of all governmental prerogatives, the Power of the Purse,

is vested solely in the House of Representatives by the Constitution which provides in Article I, Section 7 that "[A]ll bills for the raising of revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

Madam Speaker, the Preamble explains that the reason "We, The People of the United States," established the Constitution was to create a more perfect union where justice reigned and the law protected everyone, where the general welfare of the community was a paramount objective and liberty was secured for everyone, now and for the generations to come.

Our form of government was created to secure the self-evident and inalienable right of The People to live free of arbitrary rule or despotism or tyranny.

And that is why the Constitution necessarily includes a provision to remove from office any civil officer, including the President and Vice President, whose conduct and actions pose a clear and present threat to the system created by the People to secure their happiness.

The purpose of the Impeachment Clause is to protect The People, not punish the person and that is why the Framers vested the sole power of impeachment in the institutional embodiment of The People, the House of Representatives.

And that is why a refusal to cooperate or provide information requested by the House of Representatives in furtherance of its impeachment power is different in degree and kind from other inter-branch policy disputes.

When the Chief Executive undertakes a wide-spread, full-scale, across the board campaign to impede and frustrate the House of Representatives in the exercise of its Impeachment Power, he is putting his interests and his desires above the interests of The People, the gravest offense that can be committed in a democratic republic.

The impeachment power is vested solely in the House of Representatives because no one can tell the People how to go about protecting themselves; if they are required to obtain the permission or consent of another body, then the People are not in charge of determining their fate, and that means our system can be called many things but not a democratic republic.

Madam Speaker, in 1862, at another moment of national crisis, President Lincoln said: "The fiery trial through which we pass, will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

And I say to the Members of the House that:

In honoring and defending the Constitution,
We defend and honor ourselves,
Precious alike in what we give
and what we receive.

For in honoring and defending the Constitution,

We keep faith with the Framers to whom we are heir, and
Are worthy of the esteem of our countrymen,
Now, and in the generations to come.

Madam Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I have taken an oath to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and I do not shrink from this duty.

So, with love and reverence for this country and its people, I stand with the Constitution and that is why I supported the resolution impeaching Donald John Trump, President of the

United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MR.
ROBERT B. DALEY

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mr. Robert B. Daley who passed away on December 15, 2019, at the age of 87. A veteran, dedicated teacher, loving husband, father, and grandfather, Mr. Daley will be dearly missed by his family, friends, and community.

After graduating from St. Lucy's High School in Syracuse, Mr. Daley went on to study at Le Moyne College where he earned his bachelor's degree in 1954. Mr. Daley was a lifelong advocate of Le Moyne College. It was at Le Moyne that Mr. Daley and my father became fast friends. My family is forever grateful that Mr. Daley introduced my father to my mother, Mary Lou, and was rewarded by being best man at their wedding.

Following graduation, Mr. Daley went on to enlist in the United States Army. While in the Army, Mr. Daley was stationed at Schofield Barracks in Honolulu, Hawaii. Upon completing his tour of duty in 1957, Mr. Daley returned to Central New York to work for Bristol Labs and later, at Jamesville-Dewitt High School, where he taught Chemistry and Earth Science for 34 years before retiring. Following his retirement, Mr. Daley continued to be active in the education field, consulting for Syracuse University. In this role, he observed teachers in various Central New York school districts, working to mentor the next generation of teachers.

Throughout Mr. Daley's career, he has been a dedicated volunteer, helping build homes for Habitat for Humanity, assisting with the New York State Science Olympiad, and supporting numerous activities for St. Ann Catholic Church of Manlius, where he was an active member. Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues in the House join me in honoring the life of Mr. Robert B. Daley. A devoted family man, career educator, and patriot, I wish his family peace during this incredibly difficult time.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JAPANESE AMERICAN ARCHIVAL COLLECTION

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to honor the 25th Anniversary and the magnificent work of the Japanese American Archival Collection at California State University, Sacramento (Sacramento State). I ask all my colleagues to join me in acknowledging the contributions of the Japanese American Archival Collection, as their work has preserved the deep history of Japanese Americans in the Sacramento Re-

gion, as well as the history of World War II internment, redress and reparations.

The collection was created in 1994 from the generous gifts from Mary Tsukamoto, the Florin JACL, and the Sacramento VFW Nisei Post 8985, along with many other families and community members. This collection includes Ms. Tsukamoto's educational materials about the internment camps and a wealth of material about the Japanese-American community, including pages from her father's scrapbook, news publications, and photographs. The JAAC also includes historical artifacts, such as blankets, various military records, and personal journals. Since its founding, the collection has grown to include California State University's (CSU) Japanese American Digitization Project, which is a collection of over 2,900 images and documents from 15 CSU campuses related to the WWII incarceration of American citizens of Japanese descent. This award-winning collection also includes the JAAC Imagebase, which is comprised of over 1,300 photographs in a searchable database. Through the entire collection, scholars and the public can view images that range from the pictures of the inside of an internment camp to images of the uniforms worn by the Japanese-American nurses that worked in the camps. All of the documents, photographs and artifacts in the JAAC are a piece of our nation's history and I am so pleased that Sacramento State has taken the leadership to preserve them. Finally, I must add my deep and personal appreciation to the JAAC, as it is the host the Robert Matsui Legacy collection, which includes a number of news articles, pictures and videos about the redress and reparations movement.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise to honor the important work of the Japanese American Archival Collection at Sacramento State. This archival collection is absolutely important for all Americans, as we must continue to commit to learning from our nation's history of past mistakes, if we are to not repeat them in the future. I ask all my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 25th Anniversary of this significant collection, and all those who have contributed personal items or have helped it grow.

RECOGNIZING THE 2019 INSTALLATION OF OFFICERS FOR THE DALE CITY VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2019 installation of officers for the Dale City Volunteer Fire Department which is located in Prince William County Virginia, 25 miles from our Nation's Capital. The DCVFD goes on an average of 20,000 calls per year, serving and protecting the 75,000 residents of Dale City, Virginia.

Incorporated in the Commonwealth of Virginia in 1967, the DCVFD ensures the safety of families in Dale City. Funded by the residents of Dale City and comprised of committed community members, the Department has been able to significantly grow throughout the years. From humble beginnings on the

front lawn of the first Fire Chief's home, DCVFD has expanded to five stations in the last 50 years with approximately 250 dedicated volunteers. With bravery and dedication, DCVFD is readily available for the families of Dale City.

Their motto, Second to None, amplifies their dedication of preparedness, safety, and strong community service. Over the past 50 years, DCVFD has educated and mentored the youth in Dale City, not only teaching fire safety education, but also strengthening community relations.

It is with great honor I include in the RECORD the names of the following Dale City Fire Department Officers:

Chief—Christopher Hool.

Deputy Chief of Operations—Edgar Van Horn.

Deputy Chief of Administration—James Delaverson.

Deputy Chief of EMS—Barbara Brown.

Assistant Chiefs of Training—Darrell Hudson.

Assistant Chiefs—Steve Chappell, Marc Sherman, Jeremy McPike, Sandra Sokol.

Captains—Eddy Dumire, Joshua Jensen, Linda Wortham, Thomas Mazzo, Patrick Palacios, Kimberly Batson.

Lieutenants—Thomas Borsari, Michael Cajayon, Simon Courtman, Daniel Moran, Donovan Stewart, John Van Horn, Mett Werner, Jabin Young, Stephanie DeFreitas.

Sergeants—Robert Best II, Andrew Kelly, Robert Willis, Sam Porter Sr., Jordan Maplass, Bradley Gray, Steve Chasin, Muhamad Naiz, Joe Krimmer, Lauren Clowser, Nikia Griffiths.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the newly installed officers and in recognizing the men and women of the Dale City Volunteer Fire Department for their service to our country and steadfast commitment to their community.

HONORING THE CAREER OF
MAYOR THOMAS F. KELAHER

HON. ANDY KIM

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. KIM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mayor Tom Kelaher, of Toms River, New Jersey, on the occasion of his retirement from public service.

Mayor Kelaher has devoted his career to serving his country, and his community in Ocean County. While attending college, Mayor Kelaher enlisted in the United States Marine Corps, where he served in various roles during his deployments, eventually ending his active duty service as the executive officer of the Marine Barracks at Lakehurst Naval Air Station in New Jersey. After his release from active duty, Mayor Kelaher remained in the Marine Corps Reserves.

Mayor Kelaher then began a 49-year career practicing law in the state of New Jersey. He served as Deputy Attorney General of New Jersey by Governor Hughes in 1963, and was appointed as the Assistant Ocean County Prosecutor from 1969 to 1974. He also served as Prosecutor for various Ocean County municipalities. Throughout his career, Mayor Kelaher remained dedicated to improving health care services in Ocean County, serving

as a volunteer member of the Community Medical Center Board of Trustees for 25 years, Chairman of the Board for Clara Mass Medical Center, member of the Board of Trustees of Kimball Medical Center and St. Barnabas Behavior Health Center. In 1998, Mayor Kelaher was named Hospital Trustee of the Year by the New Jersey Hospital Association. Mayor Kelaher was sworn in as Mayor of Toms River on January 1, 2008, and was re-elected again in 2012 and 2015.

Over the course of his career, Mayor Kelaher has served Toms River, Ocean County, and New Jersey dutifully, and has made strides to improve the lives of his neighbors. Mayor Kelaher's will be hard shoes to fill.

I thank Mayor Kelaher for all he has done for our community in Ocean County. I hope that he will enjoy spending more time with his wife, Carol, and their eight grandchildren, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. TJ COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. COX of California. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

The Central Valley sent me to Washington to tackle our toughest issues, like skyrocketing drug prices, polluted water in rural communities, and the struggling farm economy. That's why we just passed a bill to bring down prescription drug prices, I introduced two key bills to address our Valley water needs, and I got the president to sign my Family Farmer Relief Act.

They also sent me to Washington to defend the Constitution, because that's what protects all of our rights and freedoms.

Here are the facts: Our president abused his power and used your taxpayer money to advance his own personal interest, and when Congress fulfilled its duty to investigate, the president acted as if he were above the law, obstructing the investigation by withholding witnesses and subpoenaed documents.

Both of those actions violate our sacred Constitution, which only identifies one remedy for Congress to hold the president accountable. In obeying that solemn duty to my constituents and the Constitution, it is my responsibility to cast votes in favor of both articles of impeachment, for abuse of power and for obstruction of Congress.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. JODY B. HICE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the Democrats' new definition for evidence is alle-

gations. Allegations based on hearsay, I might add. They hurl allegations against the President and then say to him it's not their responsibility to prove guilty but it's the President's responsibility to prove his innocence. This has been a sham and an act of injustice against the President and against 63 million Americans who voted for him. Although this process was rigged from the beginning, Democrats never produced a single true piece of evidence. It's time for us to stop this hoax and vote against these articles of impeachment.

IMPEACHING DONALD JOHN
TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES, FOR HIGH
CRIMES AND MISDEMEANORS

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 18, 2019

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, I would like to include in the RECORD two episodes of Pardon Me—Another Damn Impeachment Show?, a radio show hosted by Colin McEnroe of WNPR. I found these programs to be extremely enlightening and informative. I believe they should help Americans be better informed on this issue.

PARDON ME—ANOTHER DAMN IMPEACHMENT SHOW?: "A HEARTBREAKING WORK OF STAGGERING IMPEACHMENT WITH DAVE EGGERS AND MORE" & "ADAM GOPNIK: STOP SAYING IMPEACHMENT IS POLITICAL"

(Connecticut Public Radio)

A HEARTBREAKING WORK OF STAGGERING IMPEACHMENT WITH DAVE EGGERS AND MORE

Colin McEnroe: When we first started to think about doing a podcast called, "Pardon Me (Another Damn Impeachment Show?)," one of the things we agreed that we would do is not just talk to political pundits and law school professors and people like that, but explore how the culture responds to something as engulfing as an impeachment process, and then we had a chance to talk to Dave Eggers. Dave Eggers is, of course, the legendary writer and creator and editor and lots of other things and kind of an activist and also a guy who, as a journalist, and you'll hear a little bit about this, traveled around during the 2016 campaign going to a lot of Donald Trump rallies trying to understand and empathize with the people who were excited by the prospect of a President Donald Trump. . . .

Please visit this link to listen to the whole episode: <https://www.wnpr.org/post/dave-egggers-full-uncut-interview>.

ADAM GOPNIK: STOP SAYING IMPEACHMENT IS POLITICAL

Colin McEnroe: Hi. You're listening to kind of a little extra we're doing for you. Adam Gopnik, from The New Yorker. See, I'll get in trouble if I say this, but he might be the smartest person I know. I mean, there's probably a lot of other people who think they're the smartest person that I know, but you know it might be Gopnik. I mean you can't sneak anything by him, he's really that smart. And when we first started thinking about doing a very special series of shows about the impeachment process, he was one of the first people who popped into my head because Adam's already always doing what we like to do, which is thinking about politics and governance but melding it

with his very keen understanding of history and his sense of how culture works.

I mean there was no way we weren't going to do a conversation with him. So we got him. He's also now, you know a guy he's got a pull playwrighting thing going on so I think he was like running back from a rehearsal or something like that to the NPR studios in New York to talk to us. So if he sounds a little out of breath, that's why. But he's never out of ideas. So let's go. Adam Gopnik. We're so excited as part of the show to have someone who has joined our regular show many times.

Please visit this link to listen to the whole episode: <https://www.wnpr.org/post/adam-gopnik-stop-saying-impeachment-political>.

RECOGNIZING THE 2019 STARS
OVER DULLES AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Dulles Regional Chamber of Commerce for its ongoing dedication to local businesses and our community and to congratulate the 2019 "Stars Over Dulles" Award recipients.

This year, at the 24th Annual Stars Over Dulles Awards Luncheon, the Chamber will honor those extraordinary businesses, non-profit organizations, and citizens who have dedicated their talents and activities to enhancing our economy and our community.

As the former Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, and now as a Member of Congress representing this community, I have been proud to partner with the Chamber on many issues that impact the lives of our residents such as the Silver Line and in celebrating the service that so many individuals and businesses provide to our community.

It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following recipients of the 2019 Stars Over Dulles Award:

Arts Community Leader: Kathleen Jacoby, Herndon High School Band Director.

Distinguished Veteran: Paul Patton, CACI.

Financial Leader: Burke & Herbert Bank.

First Responder: Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority Police Department.

Health & Wellness Leader: Fitness Aspects.

Hospitality & Tourism Leader: Sean Hunt, Mustang Sally Brewing Company.

Minority Owned Business Leader: Remedy Intelligent Staffing.

Non-Profit Leader: MaryEllen Walsh, Western Fairfax Christian Ministries.

Real Estate & Development Leader: Dennis Sharland.

Small Business Leader: StudioOne Screen Printing and Embroidery.

Technology Leader: Cox Communications.

Transportation Leader: Georgia Graves, Bridgman Communications.

Workforce & Education Leader: Children's Science Center.

Young Professional: Merideth Pless, American Executive Transportation

Chair's Choice Award: Turning Point Suffragist Memorial Association

Eileen D. Curtis Lifetime Achievement Award: Doug Downer, President, HRI Associates

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the 2019 Stars Over Dulles Award recipients and in thanking these businesses and individuals for their many contributions to our region's economic success and quality of life. Their efforts are among the many reasons why Northern Virginia remains one of the best places in the country in which to live, work, raise a family and start a business. I congratulate the honorees on receiving these awards and wish them continued success.

IN RECOGNITION OF BIBA
CAGGIANO

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of beloved Sacramento chef and my dear friend Biba Caggiano. The legacy that Biba leaves in Sacramento will be forever felt through her restaurant and her acclaimed Italian cook books. Biba not only invigorated Sacramento's food culture but was also a symbol for hospitality and hard-work. As her husband, Vincent, and their children Carla and Paola, gather to remember her life and legacy, I ask my colleagues to stand with me in her memory.

Biba Caggiano was born in October of 1936 in Bologna, Italy. In 1960, Biba moved to New York and found work with an Italian bank. Soon after, Biba moved to Sacramento, where she made homemade Italian dishes, a rare cuisine in the region at the time. Her love for traditional Italian cuisine was popular in Sacramento, and she soon found herself cooking and teaching others. In 1986, she opened the now iconic midtown restaurant Biba, beginning the movement that revolutionized Sacramento cuisine. She continued to grow as a successful chef, cookbook author, TV personality, and restaurateur.

Since Biba has graced our region with her inspiring dishes, Sacramento has become an important place for food. She opened a path for more chefs to pursue their own culinary careers in Sacramento. It cannot be overstated the influence she has had on our city. Over her career, Biba has received the Robert Mondavi Culinary Award of Excellence, Northern California Chef of the Year, and the Sacramento Business Journal's Women Who Mean Business Award.

Madam Speaker, today we honor the incredible life of Biba Caggiano; a wife, mother, friend, teacher, and most importantly, a true Sacramento treasure. Biba will be fondly remembered by all in our community for her creative spirit and her kind hospitality. I will remember her for her spirit, talent, and courage.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I missed several votes on December 17th due to inclement weather and a flight delay.

Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 683; NAY on Roll Call No. 684; YEA on Roll Call No. 685; YEA on Roll Call No. 686 and YEA on Roll Call No. 687.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 671.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, as a result of an ongoing need to address health issues related to my Parkinson's diagnosis, and other recent health concerns, I was absent from votes yesterday, Wednesday, December 18, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted AYE on House roll call votes 695 and 696, the two articles of impeachment against President Donald J. Trump.

President Trump's actions with regard to Ukraine have undermined our national security, our democratic processes, and our Constitution. He has abused his office and betrayed the trust that the American people placed in him. Impeachment is the only recourse to hold this president accountable for his actions.

TRIBUTE TO THE 100TH SEASON
OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL
LEAGUE

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 100th season of the National Football League. Chicago is home to the 1986 Superbowl XX Champion Chicago Bears and the 7th Congressional District is one of the 13 "Original Towns" from which came the 14 charter teams that formed the American Professional Football Association, which would become the NFL.

During its inaugural 1920 season, the founding teams that competed in the new league included: the Akron Pros; Buffalo All-Americans; Canton Bulldogs; Decatur Staleys; Racine Cardinals; Chicago Tigers; Cleveland Tigers; Columbus Panhandles; Dayton Triangles; Hammond Pros; the Heralds (Detroit); Muncie Flyers; Rock Island Independents; and the Jeffersons (Rochester, N.Y.). Two years later, the new league was renamed the National Football League.

From its humble beginnings, the National Football League is now a preeminent sports league, comprised of 32 teams from 22 states

across the country. In the span of a century, the league has become intricately woven into the fabric of American life and the foremost steward of what is now known as "America's Game." The league's annual "Super Bowl" Championship is the single most-watched annual television event in the United States, bringing together individuals of all ages, races, and backgrounds through a common enthusiasm for and appreciation of the game of football.

The two pillars of the NFL are football and community, which are demonstrated through the volunteerism and philanthropic efforts of players, owners, coaches and staff, including through programs and initiatives ranging from honoring our nation's veterans and service members to promoting cancer awareness to encouraging youth to maintain active and healthy lifestyles. These efforts, both on and off the field, reflect the character, commitment, fortitude and teamwork that make our communities resilient and strong.

I therefore, recognize the National Football League as a great sports league of the United States and congratulate the NFL for 100 seasons of uniting communities across the country, and look forward to another century of NFL football.

RECOGNIZING THE WASHINGTON
REGIONAL ALCOHOL PROGRAM
LAW ENFORCEMENT AWARDS OF
EXCELLENCE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Washington Regional Alcohol Program (WRAP) and to congratulate the recipients of the 22nd Annual Law Enforcement Awards of Excellence for Impaired Driving Prevention.

Founded in 1982, WRAP is an award-winning, public-private coalition formed to fight drunk driving, drugged driving, and underage drinking in the Washington, D.C., metropolitan region. Through educational and innovative public outreach programs, WRAP is credited with keeping local alcohol-related death rates consistently below the national average. Its programs educate students and the general public on the dangers of alcohol and drugs, particularly driving while under the influence. Through the WRAP Holiday SoberRide program, individuals who are impaired can request a free cab ride home. Since SoberRide was launched in 1991, 78,926 free cab rides have been provided in the Washington Metropolitan area, preventing potential accidents and deaths.

Since 1997, WRAP has sponsored an annual Law Enforcement Awards Ceremony to honor local law enforcement professionals who have gone above and beyond the call of duty in the fight against drunk driving. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the names of the 2019 Law Enforcement Awards of Excellence for Impaired Driving Prevention recipients:

Officer Patrick Cushing—City of Alexandria Police Department.

Corporal Bret Kooharian—Arlington County Police Department.

Officer Bryce Cooper—City of Falls Church Police Department.

DWI Enforcement Squad—Fairfax County Police Department.

Senior Sergeant Bobby Galpin—Town of Herndon Police Department.

Deputy Caleb Hwang—Loudoun County Sheriff's Office.

Trooper First Class Anthony Wallace—Maryland State Police.

Officer Henry Gallagher—Metropolitan Police Department (Washington, DC).

Corporal Patricia Cox—Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority Police Department.

Police Officer III John Romack—Montgomery County Department of Police.

Corporal Thomas Kosakowski—Prince George's County Police Department.

Officer Chad Mason—Prince William County Police Department.

Officer Daniel Begendorf—United States Capitol Police.

Officer Christopher Gogarty—United States Park Police.

Trooper Lucie Vajglova—Virginia State Police.

Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the recipients of the Law Enforcement Awards of Excellence and in recognizing WRAP for its 37 years of public service. I commend the staff of WRAP under the leadership of President and CEO Kurt Erickson and Board Chairman Gary Cohen for their tireless dedication to eradicating underage drinking and drunk or drugged driving. Their efforts combined with the support of partner organizations and law enforcement agencies have saved lives and are deserving of our highest praise and gratitude.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. NADLER. Madam, Speaker, due to a family emergency, I was not in Washington, D.C. on December 17, 2019, and, as a result, I missed eight votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on roll call vote no. 683, ordering the previous question providing for consideration of H.R. 1158, H.R. 1865, and for adoption of H. Res. 761; "aye" on roll call vote no. 684, on agreeing to H.Res. 765, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 1158, H.R. 1865, and for adoption of H. Res. 761; "aye" on roll call vote no. 685, final passage of H.R. 4183, the "Identifying Barriers and Best Practices Study Act;" "aye" on roll call vote no. 686, final passage of H.R. 3530, the "Improving Confidence in Veterans' Care Act;" "aye" on roll call vote no. 687, final passage of H.R. 722, the "Miracle Mountain Designation Act;" "aye" on roll call no. 688, final passage of H.R. 2548, the "Hazard Eligibility and Local Projects Act;" "aye" on roll call no. 689, on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to H.R. 1865, the "National Law Enforcement Museum Commemorative Coin Act;" and "no" on roll call no. 690, on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to H.R. 1158, the "DHS Cyber Hunt and Incident Response Team Act."

I also was not in Washington, D.C. on December 19, 2019, and, as a result, I missed

three votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on roll call vote no. 699, the motion to recommit with instructions H.R. 5377, the "Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act;" "aye" on roll call vote no. 700, final passage of H.R. 5377; and "no" on roll call vote no. 701, final passage of H.R. 5430, "to implement the USMCA."

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR COY PAYNE

HON. GREG STANTON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. STANTON. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Coy Payne, the first African-American to serve as mayor in the state of Arizona, who passed away Sunday, December 8, 2019, at the age of 90. Arizonans will remember him as a trailblazer who overcame the struggles of poverty and racism to dedicate his life to serving his community. From his time as a soldier in the Korean War, to his time teaching elementary school students, to his time as a civil rights leader, Mayor Payne's enduring legacy was love for his community.

The second of nine children born to sharecroppers in Sulphur Springs, Texas, on May 22, 1929, Payne's family relocated to Eloy, Arizona in the 1940s, where they worked the fields to earn enough money to buy a car. They relocated to Chandler shortly after, where Payne attended segregated schools in Chandler and Mesa. After graduating from the only high school he could attend, George Washington Carver High School in downtown Phoenix—an hour bus ride and 30-minute walk away from home—Payne was drafted by the U.S. Army to serve in the Korean War. After returning from Korea, he received a degree in education from Arizona State University and taught in the Chandler Unified School District—the very district that denied him an education as a child. He continued teaching students there for more than thirty years.

It was during this time as an educator and administrator that he also became an advocate. He joined the Chandler Human Relations Committee and worked to improve race relations in Chandler. In 1980, Payne won a seat on Chandler City Council. And in 1990, Payne won a landslide victory in the mayoral election, becoming the first African American to serve as a mayor of any city in the State of Arizona. Chandler's population ballooned 96 percent during his tenure as mayor—and he steered that growth in a positive direction. The impact of his leadership is still felt in City Hall, and his spirit of service is carried on by the many he influenced and mentored. Thank you, Mayor Payne, and Godspeed.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD "RICK" GRAHAM HILL

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Richard "Rick" Graham Hill of Oneida, Wisconsin. Rick was born on

January 6, 1953, in Detroit, Michigan, and lived a life filled with love and compassion for both his community and nation. He was a politician, innovator, entrepreneur and leader.

Rick descended from a family committed to public service. His grandmother, Dr. L. Rosa Minoka Hill, was the second American Indian woman doctor in the nation, and his mother was a registered nurse. He began following in the footsteps of his family at a young age, often accompanying his father to tribal meetings, which cultivated him into the leader he eventually became.

Rick went go on to be a long-serving councilman and vice-chairman of the Oneida Nation, and served two non-consecutive terms as the nation's chairman. During his first term, he also served simultaneously as chairman of the National Indian Gaming Association (NIGA), representing and advocating for 168 federally-recognized tribes in the gaming industry. Under his leadership, NIGA became a nationally-recognized voice on Indian gaming issues, and successfully initiated the development of national regulatory standards and policies for tribal governmental gaming. As chairman of the Oneida Nation, Rick signed the first gaming compact with the state of Wisconsin. Even after retirement, Rick continued his service by forming Hill Group, LLC. There he consulted with various stakeholders to identify economic development projects and partnerships in Indian Country. He also formed RGH Holdings the first ever consortium of tribes to invest in real estate development projects outside of the reservations. Out of all his contributions, Rick was most proud of his work serving on the board of the Native American Rights Fund and the Public Sector Gaming Study Commission.

His devotion and commitment to serving others has been recognized with honors and awards including: the Eagle Visionary Award, the Pathbreakers Award and induction into the Indian Gaming Hall of Fame. He was also the first Indian Gaming inductee into the Gaming Hall of Fame.

He was a loving husband, father, and tenderhearted coach to his sons and so many others. Rick leaves to cherish his memory: his spouse, and my dear friend, Donsia Strong Hill, as well as his children: Richard (Desirae), Sage, Dakota, and his two grandchildren: Asher and Vine. He is also survived by siblings: Barbara Author, Norbert, Jr. (Mary), Rosa (Rick) Coenen; sister-in-law, Lenora Hatathlie and brother-in-law, Mike Author; his nieces: Megan, Sarah, Maria, Nasbah (Jamison), Nanabah (Michael), Melissa (Scott); and his nephews: DinéNizhoni, Christopher (Maria), Mark, Nabahe, Norbert III (Erin), and goddaughter, Jolene Billie; and long-term business partner and colleague, Dawn Reiter.

Rick always credited his success to those who supported, mentored and befriended him while working in Indian Country. I am proud to have worked with Rick over a 30-year period and happy to have called him my friend. I am inspired by his work to continuously help other tribes and will work collaboratively with them to establish strong tribal governments. Everything he's accomplished came from the heart, and the legacy he leaves behind reflects the positive impact of his service.

Madam Speaker, it is for these reasons I rise to salute Richard "Rick" Graham Hill, a man who has made the State of Wisconsin and our nation a better place.

SUPPORT FOR FOREST SERVICE AS CO-LEAD FOR ANY NEPA-REQUIRED ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW OF TWIN METALS MINE PLAN ADJACENT TO THE BOUNDARY WATERS CANOE AREA WILDERNESS

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, a mine plan of operation for a Twin Metals sulfide-ore copper mine adjacent to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCA) and upstream of Voyageurs National Park was submitted to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on December 18, 2019, along with applications for federal mineral leases. The proposed mine site is on Superior National Forest land in Minnesota. NEPA-required environmental review is expected to commence early in 2020.

The Superior National Forest and the BWCA are managed by the Forest Service. Under 16 USC Sec. 508b the Forest Service has independent consent authority for mining approvals in the Superior National Forest and thus has co-equal authority for mining decisions. For 20 months in 2017 and 2018, the Forest Service led a detailed study of environmental, economic, and social impacts of copper mining in the watershed of the BWCA.

For all of these reasons, Congress expects that any NEPA-required environmental review of a Twin Metals mine plan and federal mineral leases be co-led by the Forest Service and the BLM, and not led solely by the BLM.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2019 NORTHERN VIRGINIA LEADERSHIP AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Mr. CONNOLLY. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the 2019 recipients of the Northern Virginia Leadership Awards presented by Leadership Fairfax.

Leadership Fairfax is a nonprofit corporation whose mission is to inspire, connect, develop and engage the next generation of leaders in Northern Virginia so that they are prepared to serve and strengthen our community. Graduates from its programs become part of a fast-growing network of civic leaders. I've always said, "When you walk into a crowded room, it's easy to spot the graduates of Leadership Fairfax—they just stand out."

Each year, Leadership Fairfax recognizes individuals or organizations that have demonstrated exceptional leadership and made extraordinary contributions to our community. It is my honor to include in the RECORD the following names of the 2019 Northern Virginia Leadership Awards recipients:

Non-Profit Leader: Joe Meyer, CEO, Shelter House.

Corporate Leadership, Organization: Womble Bond Dickinson.

Corporate Leadership, Individual: Shirley Luu, Shirley Luu & Associates.

Regional Leadership: Danny Vargas, President, VARCom Solutions.

Trustee Leadership: Linda Mathes, CEO, Red Cross in the National Capital Region.

Educational Leadership: Rebecca Cousins, West Springfield High School.

Madam Speaker, the contributions of these individuals and organizations are one of the reasons why Fairfax is such a sought after community in which to live and work, and this year's honorees highlight the legacy of Leadership Fairfax in preparing our community's future leaders to address the challenges we face. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these honorees and thanking them for their service to Northern Virginia.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 2019 NORTHERN VIRGINIA LEADERSHIP AWARDS

HON. ERIC SWALWELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the Colonel Jacqueline Jayneen Jackson, on occasion of her retirement after over 30 years of service in the United States Army.

Colonel Jackson joined the Army in 1986 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps at Stanford University. It was from there that she obtained a degree in political science. She went on to earn a law degree from the University of California, Los Angeles, and she entered the Judge Advocate General's Corps in 1989.

While on active duty, Colonel Jackson served in several roles, including trial counsel. These assignments took her to California, New Jersey, Washington, D.C., Virginia, and Texas throughout her career.

Colonel Jackson continued her career in the United States Army Reserve (USAR) where she served in the USAR Element on the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, D.C. She also served as a military social aide for the White House during the George H. Bush and Bill Clinton administrations.

Colonel Jackson's commendable service earned her multiple decorations, including the Defense Superior Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with four Oak Leaf Clusters, Joint Service Army Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal, and Army Achievement Medal.

In her civilian life Colonel Jackson continues to answer the call for justice as an immigration judge with the Department of Justice in San Francisco.

Throughout her career, Colonel Jackson has carried on the legacy of her father, United States Air Force Technical Sergeant Edwin Jackson, who died in service to our country. Her exceptional work surely made both her father and mother, Edna Jackson, extremely proud. Colonel Jackson also draws support from her husband, Morris A. Graves, Jar.

On behalf of the Fifteenth Congressional District of California, I would like to commend Colonel Jackson on an impeccable career of dedicated service and offer her best wishes for a happy retirement.

12 DAYS OF SALT

HON. MIKIE SHERRILL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 19, 2019

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, to conclude my earlier remarks on the 12 Days of SALT, I rise to include in the RECORD the testimonials of mayors from New Jersey's 11th District attesting to the harm that the SALT cap has had on their communities.

On this ninth day of SALT, a bipartisan group of mayors in my district have shared with me, statements about how SALT is harming our residents in New Jersey's 11th Congressional District. Today, I'd like to share their words:

Mayor Molly Whilesmith of Sparta said:

"The exodus from New Jersey is nothing new. Our state and local property taxes have been amongst the highest in the nation for decades. New Jersey Snowbirds flocked South upon retirement. The current trend is to sell the house and pack the moving truck right after the youngest child graduates from high school. The cap makes NJ much less attractive for the average hardworking New Jersey Family."

Mayor Keith Kazmark of Woodland Park:

"The full SALT deduction must be reinstated for the benefit of New Jersey middle class families. Folks in our area were hardest hit by this change in the tax code. 51% of Woodland Park taxpayers pay more than \$10,000 in local property taxes and that does not include their state taxes. That's over 1,800 residential property owners in our town."

Mayor Bruce Harris of Chatham Borough said:

"The story for Chatham Borough is pretty simple. The average property tax bill is about \$14,100, so 40% is no longer deductible. Obviously, that impacts people's pockets; it also impacts housing values. NJ is a payer state—it sends much more to the federal government than it receives back."

According to Mayor Jeff Grayzel of Morris Township:

"We all teach our children to play fair, because fairness in one of the key elements that makes our democracy the great thing it is. However, the cap on SALT deductions is simply unfair and penalizes the residents of New Jersey. Let's be fair to all and drop this penalty on New Jerseyans."

Mayor John Kelley, Borough of Caldwell:

"Caldwell taxpayers are directly impacted and blindsided by the limits put on SALT deductions. Caldwell families manage their finances and tax liability closely and for many years have relied upon their state income taxes and Caldwell property taxes to reduce their federal income tax through itemized deductions. The impact of the limits on SALT deductions are felt throughout our community."

Mayor Michael Soriano, Parsippany:

"Parsippany is a community similar to many across the country, but unlike towns in other states, Congress decided to target our residents with a tax bill that limits their ability to deduct state and local taxes. Homeowners in Parsippany shouldn't have to pay more in federal tax dollars when we know the money isn't coming back to fund our schools or repair our roads."

Our mayors are on the ground in our communities and know that the SALT deduction

cap is harmful to our residents. This isn't a It's time for Congress to stop punishing our municipalities and our taxpayers and reinstate
Republican or a Democratic issue in our state. the full SALT deduction.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1865, Further Consolidated Appropriations Act.

Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1158, Consolidated Appropriations Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S7167–S7240

Measures Introduced: Forty-three bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3106–3148, and S. Res. 458–462. **Pages S7207–08**

Measures Reported:

Special Report entitled “Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2020”. (S. Rept. No. 116–181)

Special Report entitled “Measuring the Economic Impact of Broadband Act of 2019”. (S. Rept. No. 116–186)

Special Report entitled “Veterans Expedited TSA Screening Safe Travel Act”. (S. Rept. No. 116–187)

Special Report entitled “TSA Credential and Endorsement Harmonization Act of 2019”. (S. Rept. No. 116–188)

S. 496, to preserve United States fishing heritage through a national program dedicated to training and assisting the next generation of commercial fishermen. (S. Rept. No. 116–83)

S. 149, to establish a Senior Scams Prevention Advisory Council, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–182)

S. 893, to require the President to develop a strategy to ensure the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems and infrastructure in the United States and to assist allies and strategic partners in maximizing the security of next generation mobile telecommunications systems, infrastructure, and software, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–184)

S. 2166, to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Adminis-

tration, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–185)

S. 886, to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to make the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund permanent, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 116–189) **Page S7207**

Measures Passed:

Broadband Deployment Accuracy and Technological Availability Act: Senate passed S. 1822, to require the Federal Communications Commission to issue rules relating to the collection of data with respect to the availability of broadband services, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7178–85**

Wicker Amendment No. 1268, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7180**

Enrollment Correction: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 81, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1158. **Page S7193**

Enrollment Correction: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 82, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 1865. **Page S7193**

Securing American Nonprofit Organizations Against Terrorism Act: Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2476, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and the bill was then passed. **Page S7226**

Fallen Warrior Battlefield Cross Memorial Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1424, to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure the Secretary of Veterans Affairs permits the display of Fallen Soldier Displays in national cemeteries, and the bill was then passed. **Page S7226**

Construction Consensus Procurement Improvement Act: Senate passed S. 1434, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S7229**

McConnell (for Portman) Amendment No. 1269, to modify the definition of reverse auction to cover the awarding of contracts and orders that are based solely on the price obtained through the auction process. **Page S7229**

Members of Congress Pension Opt Out Clarification Act: Senate passed S. 439, to allow Members of Congress to opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System, and allow Members who opt out of the Federal Employees Retirement System to continue to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Page S7229**

McConnell (for Cardin) Amendment No. 1270, to improve the bill. **Page S7229**

Department of Veterans Affairs Provider Accountability Act: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of S. 221, to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Under Secretary of Health to report major adverse personnel actions involving certain health care employees to the National Practitioner Data Bank and to applicable State licensing boards, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7229–30**

McConnell (for Gardner/Manchin) Amendment No. 1271, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7230**

Improving Safety and Security for Veterans Act: Senate passed S. 3147, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress reports on patient safety and quality of care at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs. **Pages S7230–31**

Veterans Legacy Program: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2385, to permit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a grant program to conduct cemetery research and produce educational materials for the Veterans Legacy Program, and the bill was then passed. **Page S7231**

National Cemetery Association Tribal Training: Committee on Veterans' Affairs was discharged from

further consideration of S. 2096, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize States and tribal organizations that receive grants from the National Cemetery Administration for establishment, expansion, or improvement of a veterans' cemeteries to use amounts of such grants for State and tribal organization cemetery personnel to train at the training center of the National Cemetery Administration, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7231–32**

McConnell (for Boozman) Amendment No. 1272, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7232**

Merchant Mariners of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 550, to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Merchant Mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7232–33**

McConnell (for Murkowski/Cruz) Amendment No. 1273, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7232**

Dogs as Witness Guardians Act: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. 1029, to allow the use of certified facility dogs in criminal proceedings in Federal courts, and the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7233–34**

McConnell (for Cornyn) Amendment No. 1274, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7233**

Majority Party's Membership on Certain Committees: Senate agreed to S. Res. 459, to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen. **Page S7213**

American Geophysical Union Centennial: Senate agreed to S. Res. 460, congratulating the American Geophysical Union on the occasion of its centennial. **Pages S7213–14**

Congratulating Seattle Sounders FC: Senate agreed to S. Res. 461, congratulating Seattle Sounders FC on winning the 2019 Major League Soccer Cup. **Page S7214**

Combating Global Corruption Act: Senate passed S. 1309, to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to assess United States assistance to designated countries in order to advance anti-corruption efforts in those countries and better serve United States taxpayers, after withdrawing the committee amendment

in the nature of a substitute, and agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S7234–36**

McConnell (for Cardin) Amendment No. 1275, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S7236**

National One Health Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 462, designating January 2020 as “National One Health Awareness Month” to promote awareness of organizations focused on public health, animal health, and environmental health collaboration throughout the United States and to recognize the critical contributions of those organizations to the future of the United States.

Pages S7215, S7236

Promoting Physical Activity for Americans Act: Senate passed S. 1608, to provide for the publication by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of physical activity recommendations for Americans, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S7239–40**

House Messages:

Pallone-Thune TRACED Act: Senate agreed to the motion to concur in the amendment of the House to S. 151, to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934. **Pages S7176–78**

Further Consolidated Appropriations Act: By 71 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 415), Senate agreed to McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1865, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, after taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S7185–86

Withdrawn:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1258 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to change the enactment date. **Pages S7167–70**

McConnell Amendment No. 1259 (to Amendment No. 1258), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1258 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment) (listed above) was withdrawn. **Pages S7167–70**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 71 yeas to 21 nays (Vote No. 413), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on McConnell motion to con-

cur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Pages S7170–76**

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1260, to change the enactment date, fell when cloture was invoked on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Pages S7167–70**

McConnell Amendment No. 1261 (the instructions (Amendment No. 1260) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1260 (listed above) fell. **Pages S7167–70**

McConnell Amendment No. 1262 (to Amendment No. 1261), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 1261 (the instructions (Amendment No. 1260) of the motion to refer) (listed above) fell. **Pages S7167–70**

By 64 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 414), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to waive all applicable sections of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable budget resolutions with respect to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1865 (listed above). Subsequently, the point of order that the bill was in violation of section 3101(b) of S. Con. Res. 11, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2016 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 through 2025, was not sustained, and thus the point of order fell. **Pages S7185–86**

Consolidated Appropriations Act: By 81 yeas to 11 nays (Vote No. 428), Senate agreed to McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 1158, to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, after taking action on the following motions and amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S7192–93**

Withdrawn:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1263 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to change the enactment date. **Page S7192**

McConnell Amendment No. 1264 (to Amendment No. 1263), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell Amendment No. 1263 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment) (listed above) was withdrawn. **Page S7192**

During consideration of this measure today, Senate also took the following action:

By 77 yeas to 16 nays (Vote No. 427), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, having voted in the affirmative, Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Pages S7192–93**

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1265, to change the enactment date, fell when cloture was invoked on McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill. **Page S7192**

McConnell Amendment No. 1266 (the instructions (Amendment No. 1265) of the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell Amendment No. 1265 (listed above) fell. **Page S7192**

McConnell Amendment No. 1267 (to Amendment No. 1266), of a perfecting nature, fell when McConnell Amendment No. 1266 (the instructions (Amendment No. 1265) of the motion to refer) (listed above) fell. **Page S7192**

Appointments:

United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106–398, as amended by Public Law 108–7, and in consultation with the Chairmen of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the appointment of the following individuals to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: Roy Kamphausen of Connecticut for a term expiring December 31, 2021 (reappointment) and The Honorable James M. Talent of Missouri for a term expiring December 31, 2021 (reappointment). **Page S7237**

United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: The Chair announced, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106–398, as amended by Public Law 108–7, and in consultation with the Ranking Members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission: The Honorable Carte P. Goodwin of West Virginia for a term beginning January 1, 2020 and expiring December 31, 2021 (reappointment). **Page S7237**

Signing Authority—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Portman be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions during today's session of the Senate. **Page S7225**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator McConnell be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions through Monday, December 23, 2019. **Page S7237**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that Senator Hoeven be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions during today's session of the Senate. **Page S7240**

Pro Forma Sessions—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the Senate adjourn, to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, December 23, 2019, at 10 a.m.; Thursday, December 26, 2019, at 3:15 p.m.; Monday, December 30, 2019, at 2 p.m.; Thursday, January 2, 2020, at 6:30 p.m.; and that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, January 2, 2020, it next convene at 12 noon, on Friday, January 3, 2020, pursuant to the Constitution. **Page S7237**

Nominations in Status Quo—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the list of nominations at the desk be kept in status quo despite the sine die adjournment of the first session of the 116th Congress. **Page S7238**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 76 yeas to 17 nays (Vote No. EX. 416), Anuraag Singhal, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida. **Pages S7186–88**

By 87 yeas to 6 nays (Vote No. EX. 417), Karen Spencer Marston, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. **Pages S7188–89**

By 51 yeas to 41 nays (Vote No. EX. 418), Daniel Mack Traynor, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota. **Page S7189**

By 75 yeas to 17 nays (Vote No. EX. 419), Jodi W. Dishman, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma. **Page S7189**

By 83 yeas to 9 nays (Vote No. EX. 420), John M. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. **Pages S7189–90**

By 91 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. EX. 421), Bernard Maurice Jones II, of Oklahoma, to be United

States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma. **Page S7190**

By 91 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. EX. 422), Mary Kay Vyskocil, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York. **Page S7190**

By a unanimous vote of 94 yeas (Vote No. EX. 423), Kea Whetzal Riggs, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico. **Pages S7190–91**

By 66 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. EX. 424), Robert J. Colville, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania. **Page S7191**

By 64 yeas to 29 nays (Vote No. EX. 425), Lewis J. Liman, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York. **Page S7191**

Gary Richard Brown, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York. **Page S7191**

Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. **Pages S7191–92**

By 90 yeas to 3 nays (Vote No. EX. 426), Stephen E. Biegun, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of State. **Page S7192**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Stephen E. Biegun, of Michigan, to be Deputy Secretary of State, be withdrawn. **Page S7191**

Michael Graham, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2020.

David T. Fischer, of Michigan, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Morocco.

Michelle A. Bekkering, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Morse H. Tan, of Illinois, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Criminal Justice.

Roxanne Cabral, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of the Marshall Islands.

LaJuana S. Wilcher, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation.

Kelley Eckels Currie, of Georgia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

Michael Graham, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2025.

Leslie Meredith Tsou, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Sultanate of Oman.

Dana S. Deasy, of Virginia, to be Chief Information Officer of the Department of Defense.

Yuri Kim, of Guam, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Albania.

Carmen G. Cantor, of Puerto Rico, to be Ambassador to the Federated States of Micronesia.

Lisa W. Hershman, of Indiana, to be Chief Management Officer of the Department of Defense.

Robert S. Gilchrist, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lithuania.

Alina L. Romanowski, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the State of Kuwait.

Robert John Sander, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.

Kelly C. Degnan, of California, to be Ambassador to Georgia.

Peter M. Haymond, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Lao People's Democratic Republic.

Sean O'Donnell, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency.

Thomas B. Chapman, of Maryland, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 2023.

J. Brett Blanton, of Virginia, to be Architect of the Capitol for the term of ten years.

Routine lists in the Foreign Service. **Page S7240**

Messages from the House: **Page S7206**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Pages S7170–76**

Measures Read the First Time: **Page S7206**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S7206**

Executive Communications: **Pages S7206–07**

Petitions and Memorials: **Page S7207**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S7208–11**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S7211–12**

Additional Statements: **Pages S7204–06**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S7215–21**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S7221**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S7222**

Record Votes: Sixteen record votes were taken today. (Total—428)

Pages S7176, S7186, S7188, S7189–93

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m. and adjourned at 8:37 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Monday, December 23, 2019. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S7240.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

IMPACTS OF WILDFIRE ON THE ELECTRIC GRID

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the impacts of wildfire on electric grid reliability and efforts to mitigate wildfire risk and increase grid resiliency, after receiving testimony from Carl Imhoff, Manager, Electricity

Market Sector, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Department of Energy; Scott Corwin, Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Washington; William D. Johnson, Pacific Gas and Electric Company Corporation, San Francisco, California; B. Don Russell, Texas A&M University Department of Electric and Computer Engineering Power System Automation Laboratory, College Station; and Michael Wara, Stanford University Woods Institute for the Environment Climate and Energy Policy Program, Stanford, California.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 43 public bills, H.R. 5490–5532; 1 private bill, H.R. 5533; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 773–775, were introduced.

Pages H12289–90

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages H12292–93

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 772, providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–357);

H.R. 5430, to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement (H. Rept. 116–358, Part 1);

Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Cathy McMorris Rodgers (H. Rept. 116–359);

H.R. 5130, to amend the Small Business Act to adjust the employment size standard requirements for determining whether a manufacturing concern is a small business concern, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–360); and

H.R. 5146, to amend the Small Business Act to require contracting officers to take a small business concern's past performance as part of a joint venture into account when evaluating the small business concern, and for other purposes (H. Rept. 116–361).

Page H12289

Committee on Oversight and Reform—Communication: Read a letter from Chairwoman Maloney wherein she notified the House of the initiation by the Committee on Oversight and Reform of judicial

proceedings pursuant to H. Res. 497 and H. Res. 430.

Page H12213

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 773, electing certain Members to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives.

Page H12213

Recess: The House recessed at 1:29 p.m. and reconvened at 1:45 p.m.

Page H12270

Recess: The House recessed at 1:45 p.m. and reconvened at 2:07 p.m.

Page H12270

Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act: The House passed H.R. 5377, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, by a recorded vote of 218 yeas to 206 nays, Roll No. 700.

Pages H12214–21, H12270–84

Agreed to the Rice motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, by a yeas-and-nays vote of 388 yeas to 36 nays, Roll No. 699. Subsequently, Representative Thompson (CA) reported the bill back to the House with the amendment and the amendment was agreed to.

Pages H12270–84

Pursuant to the Rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted.

Page H12214

H. Res. 772, the rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5377) was agreed to by a yeas-and-nays vote of 227 yeas to 196 nays, Roll No. 698, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 227 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 697.

Pages H12214–21

United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act: The House passed H.R. 5430, to

implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, by a yea-and-nay vote of 385 yeas to 41 nays, Roll No. 701.

Pages H12221–H12269

Committee Resignation: Read a letter from Representative Jordan wherein he resigned from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Page H12285

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence—Appointment: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Representative Crawford, to rank after Representative Stewart.

Page H12285

Presidential Message: Read a message from the President wherein he notified the Congress that the national emergency with respect to the prevalence and severity of human rights abuse and corruption that was declared in Executive Order 13818 of December 20, 2017 is to continue in effect beyond December 20, 2019. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 116–87).

Pages H12213–14

Senate Referrals: S. Con. Res. 31 was referred to the Committee on Oversight and Reform. S. 153 was referred to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Veterans Affairs. S. 2774 was held at the desk. S. 3105 was held at the desk. S. 1822 was held at the desk.

Page H12288

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appears on pages H12269–70, H12285.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H12220, H12220–21, H12283, H12283–84, and H12284–85. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2575, the “AI in Government Act of 2019”; H.R. 3830, the “Taxpayers Right-To-Know Act”; H.R. 3883, the “Restore the Partnership Act”; H.R. 3941, the “Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program Authorization Act”; H.R. 5214, the “Representative Payee Fraud Prevention Act of 2019”; S. 375, the “Payment Integrity Information Act of 2019”; H.R. 2454, to

designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 East Sharpfish Street in Rosebud, South Dakota, as the “Ben Reifel Post Office Building”; H.R. 2969, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1401 1st Street North in Winter Haven, Florida, as the “Althea Margaret Daily Mills Post Office Building”; H.R. 3275, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 340 Wetmore Avenue in Grand River, Ohio, as the “Lance Corporal Andy ‘Ace’ Nowacki Post Office”; H.R. 2246, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 201 West Cherokee Street in Brookhaven, Mississippi, as the “Deputy Donald William Durr, Corporal Zach Moak, and Patrolman James White Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 3680, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 415 North Main Street in Henning, Tennessee as the “Paula Robinson and Judy Spray Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 3847, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 West Poythress Street in Hopewell, Virginia, as the “Reverend Curtis West Harris Post Office Building”; H.R. 3976, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12711 East Jefferson Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the “Aretha Franklin Post Office Building”; H.R. 4034, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 602 Pacific Avenue in Bremerton, Washington, as the “John Henry Turpin Post Office Building”; H.R. 4200, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 321 South 1st Street in Montrose, Colorado, as the “Sergeant David Kinterknecht Post Office”; H.R. 4725, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8585 Criterion Drive in Colorado Springs, Colorado, as the “Chaplain (Capt.) Dale Goetz Memorial Post Office Building”; H.R. 4734, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 171 South Maple Street in Dana, Indiana, as the “Ernest ‘Ernie’ T. Pyle Post Office”; H.R. 4785, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1305 U.S. Highway 90 West in Castroville, Texas, as the “Lance Corporal Rhonald Dain Rairdan Post Office”; H.R. 4975, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1201 Sycamore Square Drive in Midlothian, Virginia, as the “Dorothy Braden Bruce Post Office Building”; H.R. 5062, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9930 Conroy Windermere Road in Windermere, Florida, as the “Officer Robert German Post Office Building”; H.R. 4981, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2505 Derita Avenue in Charlotte, North Carolina, as the “Julius L. Chambers Civil Rights

Memorial Post Office”; H.R. 3005, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13308 Midland Road in Poway, California, as the “Ray Chavez Post Office Building”; H.R. 4672, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 21701 Stevens Creek Boulevard in Cupertino, California, as the “Petty Officer 2nd Class (SEAL) Matthew G. Axelson Post Office Building”; H.R. 5037, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3703 North Main Street in Farmville, North Carolina, as the “Walter B. Jones, Jr. Post Office”; H.R. 4279, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 445 Main Street in Laceyville, Pennsylvania, as the “Melinda Gene Piccotti Post Office”; H.R. 4794, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8320 13th Avenue in Brooklyn, New York, as the “Mother Frances Xavier Cabrini Post Office Building”; H.R. 5384, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Crosby Street in Mansfield, Louisiana, as the “Dr. C.O. Simpkins, Sr., Post Office”; and H.R. 3317, to permit the Scipio A. Jones Post Office in Little Rock, Arkansas, to accept and display a portrait of Scipio A. Jones, and for other purposes.

H.R. 51: MAKING D.C. THE 51ST STATE

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee concluded a hearing entitled “H.R. 51: Making D.C. the 51st State”.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Energy held a markup on H.R. 2986,

the “BEST Act”; H.R. 5374, the “Advanced Geothermal Research and Development Act of 2019”; and H.R. 5428, the “Grid Modernization Research and Development Act of 2019”. H.R. 2986, H.R. 5374, and H.R. 5428 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended.

BUSINESS MEETING

Select Committee on the Modernization of Congress: Full Committee held a business meeting to consider recommendations to Encourage Civility and Bipartisanship in Congress, Streamline Processes and Save Taxpayer Dollars, and Increase the Quality of Constituent Communication. The recommendations passed.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, p. D1384)

H.R. 5363, to reauthorize mandatory funding programs for historically Black colleges and universities and other minority-serving institutions. Signed on December 19, 2019. (Public Law 116–91)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 2019

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Monday, December 23

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11 a.m., Monday, December 23

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11 a.m.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Allen, Rick W., Ga., E1617
 Babin, Brian, Tex., E1629
 Balderson, Troy, Ohio, E1630
 Brooks, Susan W., Ind., E1620, E1623
 Carbajal, Salud O., Calif., E1619
 Case, Ed, Hawaii, E1625, E1628
 Cárdenas, Tony, Calif., E1626
 Collins, Doug, Ga., E1630
 Conaway, K. Michael, Tex., E1626
 Connolly, Gerald E., Va., E1618, E1619, E1621, E1633,
 E1634, E1635, E1637
 Cox, T.J., Calif., E1634
 Davis, Danny K., Ill., E1635
 DeFazio, Peter A., Ore., E1621
 Deutch, Theodore E., Fla., E1619
 Dunn, Neal P., Fla., E1620, E1624
 Evans, Dwight, Pa., E1627

Garamendi, John, Calif., E1624
 Gibbs, Bob, Ohio, E1623
 Hice, Jody B., Ga., E1634
 Hill, J. French, Ark., E1623, E1627
 Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1630
 Jackson Lee, Sheila, Tex., E1631
 Johnson, Dusty, S. Dak., E1617
 Joyce, John, Pa., E1622
 Katko, John, N.Y., E1633, E1635
 Keating, William R., Mass., E1627
 Kim, Andy, N.J., E1633
 Kind, Ron, Wisc., E1625
 Larson, John B., Conn., E1634
 Levin, Mike, Calif., E1622
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E1631
 Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1618, E1628, E1633, E1635
 McCollum, Betty, Minn., E1630, E1637
 Miller, Carol D., W.Va. E1620
 Moore, Gwen, Wisc., E1636

Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E1636
 Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia,
 E1619
 Reschenthaler, Guy, Pa., E1622
 Rice, Tom, N.C., E1617
 Roby, Martha, Ala., E1617
 Ruiz, Raul, Calif., E1624
 Ryan, Tim, Ohio, E1623
 Scott, Austin, Ga., E1618
 Serrano, José E., N.Y., E1635
 Sherrill, Mikie, N.J., E1637
 Stanton, Greg, Ariz., E1636
 Swalwell, Eric, Calif., E1637
 Timmons, William R., IV, S.C., E1629
 Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1627
 Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E1617, E1622
 Wenstrup, Brad R., Ohio, E1635



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087-390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are